

JPRS-UKO-84-019

13 December 1984

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 13, September 1984

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

13 December 1984

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST
No. 13, September 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Strengthening Mutual Trust (K. U. Chernenko)	1
K. U. Chernenko Replies to Nuclear-Free Zone Forum	3
K. U. Chernenko Replies to PRAVDA's Questions	5
The Party and the Komsomol at the Contemporary Stage of Development of Soviet Society (Yu. Ligachev)	9
Dispute on the Basics (T. Timofeyev)	26
Karl Marx on the Individual's Conditions for His Liberation and Development (G. Smirnov)	39
Ideology of a Rising Class (R. I. Kosolapov, T. I. Oyzerman)	51
Procurement Discipline (Yu. Demin)	65
Half-Faced to the Region (K. Pankova)	77
Setting Sights on the Future (M. Koz'min)	88

Major Stage of the Ethiopian Revolution (Haile Mariam Mengistu)	102
Communists and Believers (N. Koval'skiy)	114
Detente: Origins and Potentialities (Yu. Molchanov)	126
Leading the Creativity of the Masses. On the Publication of Book by V. V. Grishin, "Problems of Party-Organizational and Ideological Work"	140
JPRS Index.....	153

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 13
September 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : September 1984

Signed to press : 3 Sep 84

Copies : 902,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1984

STRENGTHENING MUTUAL TRUST

LD241131 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84)
pp 3-4

[K. U. Chernenko's address to the Japanese readers of his book of speeches and articles, published by the Kokusai Bunka Shebansa Publishing House]

[Text] When I think of Japan, the thought never leaves me of the enormous possibilities for Soviet-Japanese cooperation which are still not being exploited. For this reason I welcomed with satisfaction the proposal for the publication of a collection of my speeches and articles in your country.

Geography has determined that the USSR and Japan are close neighbors. Our shores are washed by the waters of the same Pacific Ocean, but one cannot say that relations between our countries have been pacific.

As they say, you cannot rewrite history, and all the more so now in the nuclear age when we all live on a mutually linked and fragile earth in which the requirement to harmonize full-blooded ties between the USSR and Japan, which are truly good-neighborly, persistently makes itself felt. This is essential for the sake of the vital interests of the Soviet and Japanese peoples, for the sake of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

I know how close to the heart the Japanese people--who have known the monstrous tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki--take the threat of war. The three "noes" of Japan in relation to nuclear weapons--"not to produce," "not to possess" or "not to permit"--is the fundamental political conclusion which was made by Japan at one time. We welcome it; and more than welcome it.

The Soviet Union, which was compelled to create its own, corresponding potential in response to the stepping up of the nuclear armaments of the United States, has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; moreover, not to use them at all against countries on whose territory are neither their own nor other countries' nuclear systems. Our supreme interest is to attain the curtailment of the arms race, first and foremost, of course, the nuclear arms race. We are prepared to go our own part of the way, as far as the full elimination of weapons of mass destruction, if the other side will also assume a constructive position and will adopt the principle of equality and identical security.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, I want to say three "yeses" concerning Soviet-Japanese relations.

First, we are in favor of the enrichment of political ties and contacts between the USSR and Japan. The proposal, which was advanced by the Soviet Union to Japan, to conclude a treaty of good neighborliness and cooperation remains in force. This would be an important step toward the strengthening of mutual trust and the creation of a favorable atmosphere for the continuation of talks on a peace treaty. The joint working out by our countries, with the participation of other interested states, of trust-building measures in the Far East could play a useful role in the improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Second, we are in favor of a significant expansion of mutually beneficial business links between the USSR and Japan. There are enormous latent opportunities here. The coming five-year plan in the Soviet Union and the subsequent years will be, for us, connected with the development of the very rich areas adjacent to the Baykal-Amur Railroad. We shall, of course, find use for the unique resources of that zone in our national economy; but we would be prepared to think about the participation of other countries, including Japan, in the realization of our large-scale plans.

Third, we are in favor of increasing cultural ties between the USSR and Japan. Soviet people are familiar with the works of the creative genius of the Japanese people. And we know that the Japanese people are profoundly interested in Russian and Soviet culture. Attention to each other's culture, knowledge of the spiritual heritage of every people, is a direct path to the heart and to reason.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that familiarity with the collection of my articles and speeches will help the Japanese reader to see and understand more fully that the Soviet Union strives for peace and creativity, for good relations with all of its neighbors, both those who are close and those who are far away. If this happens, I shall be sincerely glad.

From my heart I wish the Japanese people well-being and prosperity under conditions of an unbreakable peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/1

K. U. CHERNENKO REPLIES TO NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE FORUM

PM270845 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84),
p 5

[Answer addressed to G. Hetherington, mayor of Manchester (England), Secretary
of the First International Conference on Nuclear-Free Zones]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Secretary:

The First International Conference of Municipal Councils on Nonnuclear Zones and the documents that it adopted show the growth of concern among people throughout the entire world about the danger of nuclear war and awareness of the need for the most resolute and urgent measures to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation. The fact that the municipal bodies of a number of countries are now engaged in this issue is notable and encouraging. The desire of ordinary people for peace and their desire to curb the race in the most dangerous armaments is making itself powerfully felt in spite of the policies of those governments which would like to make the citizens of their countries be reconciled to the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The policy of the Soviet Union is totally in accord with the noble striving of your movement. The USSR has unilaterally adopted the commitment not to make first use of nuclear weapons. Let me remind you that we shall not use nuclear weapons against those states who renounce the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territory.

It is not hard to imagine how the situation would ease and trust would be strengthened between states, if the USSR's example were followed by other countries possessing nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has put forward a concrete program of measures to eliminate altogether the nuclear threat by means of a radical limitation on and reduction of nuclear weapons, right up to their full liquidation.

The creation of nuclear-free zones is an important trend in the struggle to strengthen security. Such zones are not a utopia. Efforts in this direction have already yielded certain results. It is necessary to multiply these efforts in all ways, step by step freeing the face of the earth from the nuclear plague.

The Soviet Union, together with the other socialist countries, is resolutely in favor of nonnuclear zones being created, particularly in northern Europe and in the Balkans, and is also in favor of theater nuclear weapons being removed from the appropriate zone in central Europe and in favor of freeing Europe from nuclear medium-range and tactical weapons.

In the struggle to curb the nuclear threat, every contribution is important and consequential. I should like to wish success to your movement which rallies the efforts being undertaken by municipal bodies in various countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/1

K. U. CHERNENKO REPLIES TO PRAVDA'S QUESTIONS

PM011651 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84), pp 6-8

[PRAVDA, 2 September 1984]

[Text] Question: The American administration has concisely restated its foreign policy goals recently. What can be said in this connection?

Answer: Indeed, U.S. leaders have recently made a number of speeches, primarily in connection with the Republican Party Convention. These speeches and the election platform adopted at the convention allow one to judge how the current U.S. administration views the world and what its intentions are. It must be said that the impression produced by all this is a depressing one.

The political goals and, primarily, the practical actions of those who determine the foreign policy direction of the United States, are patently geared to further dangerously fueling international tension. This is also the evaluation made among broad political and public circles.

Washington is flaunting its great-power ambitions and exaggerated notions of America's role and place in the modern world with cynical frankness. It lays claim to being stronger than anyone else, to rule the destinies of peoples and dictate its will to all everywhere and anywhere. In a word, it is now a question of a "crusade" against not only socialism but, in fact, the whole world.

At a time when the peoples are anxiously living for the morrow, when they expect from governments a highly responsible policy aimed at strengthening international peace, the radical limitation and cessation of the arms race and the liquidation of seats of conflict, Washington is proclaiming its intention to act with the aid of crude military forces.

In its obsession with force, it is quite simply losing its sense of reality. The world has radically changed and its problems are not solved by force. This has been repeatedly proved and by the United States' own experience, too. Its own security will not be fortified at the expense of the security of others. Also unrealizable today are its calculations of acquiring military superiority in the hope of prevailing in a nuclear war. I repeat: The Soviet

Union itself is not seeking military superiority over others, but it will not allow anyone else to achieve superiority over it. It is possible that some people in the United States still find it difficult to accustom themselves to this, but they will have to acknowledge the fact that our two states can conduct matters only on equal grounds, on the basis of consideration for each other's legitimate interests. There is no reasonable alternative to this.

Washington tries to justify its pursuit of a policy from a position of strength by referring to considerations "of a moral order." It would like to neither more nor less arrogate to itself the right to determine which states are "democracies" and which are not, whom to include--in the manner of the Pinochet regime in Chile and the racists of South Africa--among the champions of "freedom," and whom to take the big stick to--as was the case in Lebanon and elsewhere. In other words, it declares to be moral everything it regards as permissible for itself, even as far as the overthrow of legitimate governments, the policy of state terrorism, and the waging of undeclared wars. Herein lies the main cause of the exacerbation of existing and the emergence of new seats of tension, whether in the Near East, southern Africa, Central America or elsewhere.

Conflict situations, we are profoundly convinced, can and must be settled only by peaceful means, with full consideration for the interests of those directly affected, and guided by the broad goals of strengthening international security.

Take the Near East. The tragic events taking place there demonstrate that peace is not achieved via separate deals and even less so with military interference. The situation in that region can be radically improved only by the collective efforts of all interested sides. This is the basis of the Soviet plan for a peaceful settlement in the Near East, a plan that has received broad support in the Arab world and beyond.

To sum up, I would like to emphasize: However much the United States flexes its military muscle, it will not succeed in changing the world; the world will not live according to American standards.

What is essential is a transition to a policy of realism, of common sense, of businesslike collaboration in the solution of the tasks confronting mankind.

Question: Washington continues to proclaim its readiness to hold talks on space with the USSR. In your opinion, what are the actual prospects for the holding of talks on preventing the militarization of space?

Answer: Washington is not averse to talking about its readiness for negotiations and even expresses itself in the spirit of sending a delegation to Vienna. However, the U.S. administration does not really want to resolve the problem of preventing the militarization of space--its designs are aimed at concealing its negative stance from the world public and justifying the elaboration and implementation of its plans for space weapons.

Therefore, our proposal for holding space talks has not received a positive response from the American side. In discussing the aims of the talks, it has

primarily endeavored to replace the very topic of the talks. Instead of clearly agreeing to discuss the question of banning space weapons, the United States has begun to insist on the examination there of questions concerning nuclear arms in general. In other words, those issues on which negotiations were under way in Geneva and which were broken off as a result of the well-known actions of the United States.

What is the Soviet Union proposing to negotiate about? About excluding the possibility of extending the arms race into space, about completely rejecting strike space means including antisatellite weapons. In other words, to ensure that there will be no military threat to the earth from space or to space from the earth and from space itself. We propose as a first step, simultaneous with the start of negotiations, the imposition of a reciprocal moratorium on the testing and deployment of strike space systems.

Such an agreement would not only avert an arms race in space but, no less important, would facilitate the solution of questions of limiting and reducing other strategic armaments. I would especially like to stress this.

The problem of space armaments cannot be resolved by half-measures or quarter-measures. It is impossible to ban one type of antisatellite weapon while allowing another, or to ban only antisatellite weapons while giving the go-ahead to other types of space weapons. In both cases we have that very same space arms race. The U.S. position consists of the desire to actually legalize such a race. Evidence of this is provided by official statements made by American leaders both publicly and in contacts that have taken place with us.

Therefore, the American side's approach to the problem of space and, accordingly, to the goals of the negotiations is directly opposite our approach. So, what then could be the point of negotiations? Negotiations are necessary not just for the sake of negotiations, but to achieve accords which would effectively prevent a space arms race.

I hope that an understanding of the need to adopt joint measures to prevent the militarization of space will prevail within U.S. leadership circles.

Question: The desire for a resumption of Soviet-American dialogue is being expressed in the political circles of many countries. What is your attitude toward a dialogue, toward talks in the current circumstances?

Answer: As I understand it, what people have in mind is a dialogue and talks on the major political issues--the issues on whose solution the fate of the world depends. I have already said: There is no need to convince us of the benefit of such a dialogue.

We are always in favor of serious and specific negotiations. It is from these positions that we also approach the quest for solutions to existing issues with the present U.S. administration. Unfortunately, we have come up against another attitude toward negotiations. Take such a most pressing issue as the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments--strategic and medium-range armaments. For more than a year Washington sought any pretext not to

negotiate at all. This time was utilized for something else--for setting in motion extensive new military programs.

When negotiations did begin in Geneva, it became clear very quickly that the U.S. representatives had come there by no means with constructive aims, but with the intention to reach decisions that would give the United States military advantages over the Soviet Union. Of course, there is no sense in such negotiations.

Serious and fruitful negotiations are only possible when the sides' equality and identical security are strictly observed. It was Washington's rejection of this principle that led to the breaking off of the Geneva negotiations. Washington torpedoed these negotiations.

Today too the issues in need of discussion and resolution are quite sufficient. They will have to be resolved.

I wish to confirm with all certainty our readiness for dialogue, for honest and serious negotiations aimed at finding accords that take the security interests of all countries and peoples into consideration.

Such is our understanding of dialogue.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/1

THE PARTY AND THE KOMSOMOL AT THE CONTEMPORARY STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIETY

AU231230 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84)
pp 9-22

[Article by Yu. Ligachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] Communist party leadership of the society of developed socialism is acquiring an increasingly varied and all-embracing nature in our time. The problems of the economy, development of productive forces and perfection of production relations are invariably at the center of the CPSU's attention. Its influence upon all superstructure elements, the spheres of ideology and culture and social and political relations and the activities of state and social organizations is increasing.

In this sense, the important measures adopted by the party to intensify work with young people and the leadership of the Komsomol are indicative. These measures have been deeply substantiated and are embodied in the speech by K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Komsomol Organizations and in the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Improving Party Leadership of the Komsomol and Enhancing Its Role in the Communist Education of Young People."

The party regards its work with the younger generation as its strategic task. Having issued documents based on principles that have program significance for the party and Komsomol organizations, the CPSU proceeds from acknowledgment of that great role played by young people in the life of the Soviet state at the contemporary stage. Young people are the most dynamic section of society. They are our future and, in many ways, are also our present. They make a weighty contribution to the progress of the economy, science and culture and actively participate in further developing socialist democracy and strengthening the country's defense capabilities. And, in many ways, the success of the work of the party and the people to perfect developed socialism, as well as our rate of progress along the path leading to communism, depend upon the way young people turn out and how they are educated and manifest themselves.

I

The question of the place and role of young people in the struggle for the social liberation of the workers class and all the working people in the creation of a new social system is thoroughly analyzed by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. They attached exceptionally great significance to young people actively participating in the revolutionary process. It is precisely those generations embarking upon life, as the experience of history illustrates, that are capable of entering class struggles with the greatest enthusiasm and energy and are called upon to swell the ranks of those fighting against exploitation and all forms of oppression and for peace, democracy and socialism.

The closest possible mutual link exists between the youth movement and the revolutionary transforming activities of the foremost detachment of the workers class: the communist party. "We are the party of the future," V. I. Lenin wrote of the bolsheviks, "and the future belongs to young people. We are the party of innovators and it is always young people who follow innovators the most willingly. We are the party of selfless struggle against all that is old and decaying, and it is always young people who are the first to join selfless struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 14, p 163).

The aspirations of youth to give all their strength to the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the world under the leadership of the communist party can only be fully realized if the party itself adopts a favorable attitude to this aspiration and supports and develops it in every possible way. This is how our Leninist party has always operated and operates today.

The party devoted special attention to the youth movement on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The party stated in a resolution of its Sixth Congress, "On Youth Unions," that it supported the revolutionary activeness of worker and peasant youth and its striving to organize itself and form its own unions. This clearly reflected the party's determination to strive to have youth organizations acquire a truly revolutionary, socialist nature from the very outset and to have them closely associated with the party, under its ideological influence, and rallied into one union, while simultaneously remaining independent from an organizational point of view.

The experience of revolutionary struggle in our country has confirmed the correctness of this policy. It makes it possible to confidently say that if youth organizations are fragmented and ideologically disconnected, the development of young people's class awareness is made more difficult and they play into the hands of the enemies of socialism. Class enemies have attempted on more than one occasion to belittle the bolshevik party's role in the youth movement and have striven for its "independence" from the party and its "equality" with it. Lenin warned young people against "false friends" and all who, while pretending to defend their interests, in actual fact try to use young people for their own selfish ends and to separate them by forming numerous isolated youth organizations.

The party decisively rebuffed any such attempts. It expended a considerable amount of effort so that the country's progressive worker-peasant youth form a unified youth organization of a new type for the first time in history--communist in its aims and uniting representatives of all working people in its ranks.

The formation of the Komsomol was an important landmark in the history of mutual relations between the communist party and the youth movement and signified a qualitatively new stage in the movement's formation and development. The communist party has never regarded the younger generation as merely an object of education. It has always regarded and continues to regard it as an active and equal participant in social creativity, and it has helped and continues to help young people to educate themselves within the framework of the organization by "learning, organizing themselves, rallying together and struggling..." to quote Lenin ("Poln. Sobr. Soch," vol 41, p 308).

The history of the Komsomol, which now unites 42 million people, has convincingly shown that precisely this type of youth union most fully answers the tasks of young people's communist education. The interests and needs of various categories of young people are satisfied within the framework of a unified union. The Komsomol constantly seeks interesting and useful tasks for each of its detachments, as well as appropriate forms of work. However, the general content of the activities of each of these detachments and the ideological-political direction of these activities remain unified.

Immediately after it was formed, the Communist Youth Union declared its complete solidarity with the party. Recognizing the party's political leadership, it joined young people firmly to the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the workers class. For its part, the party proclaimed even then that its leadership of the Komsomol must not and would not take the form of guardianship or petty interference in its work. Strictly observing this principle, the party constantly concentrated its main attention on ensuring that the Komsomol stood firmly on a Marxist-Leninist platform.

Party leadership of the Komsomol has always been of a political nature, implemented by political means. Virtually all party congresses in the post-October period examined the problems of the Komsomol's work and the education of young people in one form or another. Party congress decisions, Central Committee resolutions concerning these problems, speeches by party leaders at Komsomol congresses, and other documents formulated party political aims which helped the Komsomol to determine the main directions of its activities at every historical stage of socialist construction, as well as urgent tasks on the fulfillment of which efforts of all young people had to be concentrated.

The CPSU's political experience teaches us that work with young people must be based on complete trust and high exactingness and on the cultivating in them of the greatest sense of responsibility for the historical fate of socialism.

While exhorting young people, the party also speaks openly with them about successes, shortcomings, negative phenomena in young people's environment and omissions in the work of the Komsomol organizations. As Lenin pointed out, we "are in favor of the youth unions enjoying full independence, but we are also

in favor of complete freedom to provide comradely criticism of their mistakes! We must not flatter young people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 30, p 226). This has become the norm in the mutual relations between the party and the Komsomol activities to rally, organize and provide a communist education for young Soviet people.

Together with the party and piously fulfilling Lenin's behests, our Komsomol has trod a great historic path. How convincingly life testifies to the fact that the Komsomol owes all of its remarkable achievements along this path to the fact that the party has always skillfully guided its work, comprehensively developed the initiative and spontaneous activities of the Youth Union, entrusted it with great and responsible tasks and set it large-scale aims which attract young people, arouse enthusiasm in them and inspire them to selfless labor and mass feats.

So it has always been during the years of the formation of soviet power, the Civil and Great Patriotic wars and during the country's peaceful development. So it was during the construction of the legendary Komsomolsk-na-Amure, the Dnepr state electric power plant and Magnitka, and the heroic epic of developing the virgin lands. And so the party acts now. By creatively utilizing all of its previous experience of working with young people and leading the Komsomol, the CPSU mobilizes the country's younger generation to new labor achievements.

In this respect, our party takes into account the fact that the contemporary stage of developed socialism has not only created the conditions necessary for the younger generation's all-around development, but it has also set new problems in work with young people. In connection with the increased scale and complication of the tasks of socialist construction and in a climate of perceptibly intensified military danger and the sharp exacerbation of the ideological antagonism between two world systems, the problems of forming new generations of fighters for communism and increasing their working and political activeness are being increasingly moved into the forefront and acquiring exceptionally great strategic significance.

In addition to these objective factors, the party's special attention to youth problems and Komsomol affairs is also dictated by other causes.

While analyzing the state of affairs in the provinces, the CPSU Central Committee established that some party committees have recently weakened their leadership of the Komsomol organizations.

For some years, many obkoms and central committees of the communist parties of the union republics have not heard party committee reports given at plenums dealing with this problem. At times, the party organs watch over the Komsomol organizations excessively. There is also the other extreme: elementary inattention to the affairs and concerns of the Komsomol. Many leaders of party and soviet organs rarely associate with young people or active Komsomol members.

Meanwhile, not only positive phenomena are present in the young people's environment although they do, of course, predominate. There is no conflict in

Soviet society between the generations and, as a whole, our young people, who have grown up in the conditions of socialism, highly value the socialist way of life, are deeply devoted to communist ideals and the party cause and are loyal to the banner of the October Revolution. However, a lack of discipline, individualism and labor and social passivity can be observed in some young people. There are young people who drink and even commit crimes. Their number is relatively small, but our society is also responsible for them. We must struggle for the soul of every young person. The interests of our society's further progress require the decisive elimination of all negative phenomena in the young people's environment.

All these factors--internal and external, objective and subjective--were taken into account by the party and its Central Committee when developing principled aims and determining measures to intensify work with young people in accordance with the vital requirements of the contemporary stage of social development. The directive to further improve party leadership of the Komsomol and to enhance the latter's role as the party's mainstay in the cause of the communist education of Soviet young people has key significance.

II

The CPSU Central Committee resolution and the speeches made by Comrade K. U. Chernenko advance and substantiate the topical, responsible tasks which now face the Komsomol and young people and they also define the meaning and content of their activities. The main thing is to fully involve young people in that multifaceted and difficult work which the party defines as the perfecting of developed socialism, to educate young people in the spirit of loyalty to the cause of communism and to cultivate them as worthy citizens of Soviet society. This principled orientation and the party directives connected with it develop and concretize Lenin's behests, applicable to contemporary conditions and contained in his speech at the Third Komsomol Congress: Young people have to learn, and the party has to teach young people communism.

The CPSU teaches young people communism using the example of the life and activities of the great Lenin and the revolutionary, combat and working traditions of the party and the people while arming them with Marxist-Leninist theory. It shows tireless concern for the younger generations' ideological-political tempering, helps them to interpret the complex phenomena of contemporary social life from class positions and strives so that the whole cause of educating, shaping and training today's young people instills communist morals in them.

The party teaches young people communism by actively drawing them into creative activity, study and work and the fulfillment of key tasks for developing the economy, science and culture. Lenin pointed out that young people can become true communists only in aware and disciplined work with workers and peasants.

The party teaches young people communism by extensively drawing them into active participation in social life and into management of the state and society.

The CPSU attaches particular importance to the Komsomol and young people making the fullest possible use of those extensive rights granted them by the USSR Constitution.

In essence, teaching young people communism means ensuring continuity of the experience of socialist revolution and socialist construction. It means teaching young people to assimilate the revolutionary experience of the older generations and to enrich it with their own achievements. "We are constantly concerned," notes Comrade K. U. Chernenko, "with preparing young people who will not falter or bend beneath the weight of their historical responsibility for the fate of the country and for the fate of socialism and peace."

Now, by defining the main directions of Komsomol activity in the sphere of the economy, the CPSU Central Committee calls upon the Komsomol organizations to mobilize young people to successfully fulfill the tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan, implement the Food and Energy programs, fulfill the tasks connected with intensifying the national economy, accelerating scientific-technical progress, comprehensively automating production and developing electronics and nuclear energy, create and introduce fundamentally new types of materials, equipment and technology and master economic methods of management.

The Komsomol has every possibility of successfully implementing this party task. It has acquired valuable experience in the work tempering of young people in large-scale national economy construction projects. The young builders of the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod Gas Pipeline and the Baykal-Amur Railway have written brilliant pages into the annals of Komsomol glory. Young men and women make a great contribution to transforming the Russian Nonchernozem and to developing the wealth of Siberia, the Far East and the Far North. Today, 65 all-union Komsomol shock forces have become a symbol of the working enthusiasm of our young people. Taking the new conditions of economic operations into account, the Komsomol organizations extensively utilize the forms of development of young people's working activeness which correspond to the specific features and age characteristics of these young people: competitions for young inventors and rationalizers, agreements on the creative cooperation of scientists and production workers, competitions for the title of best worker in the profession, work according to one system and other progressive methods of work organization. The Komsomol initiative in developing the movement of young Komsomol collectives deserves all possible support. These collectives are called upon to act as a school of education for young workers and to help in every possible way to draw them into active participation in production management. It is important to make every initiative as concrete and effective as possible. Figuratively speaking, work and not ceremonial dressing befits them more.

The lower labor collectives require great attention: brigades, farms, sections, laboratories, study groups. It is in this environment that the young individual is primarily formed; it is here that he undergoes the process of work tempering and passes through the school of collectivism and moral and internationalist education.

Tutorship operates in the lower labor collectives. More than 3 million experienced production workers are now engaged in this noble work. Their

work, which is not only imbued with concern for their own labor successes, but also for the affairs of their comrades and the interests of the collective and the whole country, deserves broad public recognition and support. They do a great deal so that those working alongside them should work no worse than they themselves. An active position to the highest degree! It is characteristic of the individual who has undergone a socialist education. The CPSU Central Committee obliges the party organizations to develop and perfect tutorship.

The role of this movement in the professional growth and education of young people must be considerably enhanced.

The student detachments that have come into being at the initiative of the Komsomol are an effective means of tempering young people in work and accustoming them to direct participation in the fulfillment of national economic tasks as soon as they leave their institute. More than 800,000 people work in these detachments every summer. During the first 3 years of the current five-year plan period alone, they fulfilled a work volume totaling 5.2 billion rubles. The student construction detachments have been highly appraised by the party and the people. At the same time, self-seeking elements sometimes make themselves known in this mass movement. In a number of places the size of the staff responsible for leading the detachments has been increased. This runs counter to the spirit of this movement, which is based upon the spontaneous activity and activeness of the students themselves. The task of the party organizations is to help Komsomol committees overcome negative phenomena in the student detachments and to adopt measures to improve their work.

Comrade K. U. Chernenko has emphasized in his speeches that one of the most serious problems in Komsomol work today is that of "petty affairs." While concentrating their main attention on large-scale undertakings, the Komsomol organizations frequently underestimate concrete, everyday matters, leaving them in the background. This kind of one-sidedness is a mistake. It is precisely from the "petty," everyday matters that the great achievements ultimately grow. Lenin persistently urged the Komsomol to strive "so that every day in any given village and any given town young people fulfill virtually any tasks of common labor, be it the smallest or the most simple" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 41, p 318).

The creation of conditions by young workers, kolkhoz workers and specialists for highly productive labor and growth of professional skill and valuable rest is a major aspect of work with young people and an essential prerequisite for increasing their working activeness. The party's Central Committee draws the attention of the party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and of the economic organs to the necessity of continually working on this problem. Providing young families with well-equipped apartments and seeking additional reserves for this purpose deserves special attention. The Komsomol could assume patronage of the building of young cooperatives. It already actively engages in drawing young people into building apartments and other projects for sociocultural purposes. There are real possibilities for increasing the scale of this work.

The dormitories in which, as is well known, mainly young people live require greater attention. It is important that they should be a desirable and truly native home for every individual living in them. The Komsomol organizations, together with the economic and trade union organs, are called upon to strive to create suitable living conditions and the maximum possible comfort in all dormitories, while showing high exactingness and adherence to principle in this matter. A strong collective must be formed in every dormitory which would operate on the basis of self-management and independently maintain order.

An important aspect of the Komsomol's work in the sphere of working and moral education is struggle against any manifestations of parasitism in the young people's environment or a consumer attitude to socialism.

Our country's young men and women have had no experience of such terrible social evils as the exploitation of man by man, unemployment, illiteracy, chauvinist and militarist intoxication and continuous lack of confidence in one's own future--that is, everything that today comprises the joyless existence of their counterparts in the capitalist world.

Under the conditions of socialism, our young people live a rich life filled with interesting affairs and major achievements in an atmosphere of real, and not imaginary, freedom and the unremitting concern of the Leninist party for the people's well-being.

While making the greatest achievements of socialism widely accessible to young people, the party simultaneously frankly tells them that the future is won by daily, at times difficult, effort. The rapidly growing demands of young people will be more fully satisfied by our society the better and more productively young people work and the more weighty their contribution to the development of the country's economy and culture. Society to young people, young people to society. The unity of the rights and responsibilities of the Soviet younger generation is reflected in this dialectical mutual connection.

III

Ideological and political-education work among Komsomol members and young people has always been, is and will continue to be a most important aspect of the Komsomol's life and activities. This work is actively carried out via the system of Komsomol political education which embraces more than 21 million young men and women in its basic forms. The Komsomol press and the youth mass information media make a great contribution to the teaching and propaganda of Marxism-Leninism and political knowledge.

The CPSU attaches great significance to further increasing the Komsomol ideological work. This is not only dictated by the increasing scale and complexity of the tasks of socialist construction, the successful fulfillment of which is directly connected with enhancing the communist awareness and activeness of all Soviet people, including young people. It must also be taken into account that the civic formation of young people is now taking place under the conditions of a most acute ideological and political struggle in the international arena. when the class enemy primarily gambles on

ideologically and morally corrupting young people in its striving to undermine the socialist system from within. The decisive battle of ideas between capitalism and socialism, say bourgeois ideologists, "must be waged in that battlefield we usually call youth."

In their attempts to drive a wedge between the communist party and the Soviet state on the one hand, and young people on the other, imperialists make use of the latter's psychological features. Our ideological opponents take into account the fact that the present younger generation has not experienced the severe ordeals of class struggle and wars, when the true face of imperialism is most clearly apparent and its hatred of the socialism system is openly manifest. It is no accident that anticommunists strive to spread feelings of political complacency among Soviet young people by every possible means and to surreptitiously ingrain in them ideas of universal class reconciliation.

All this places the education of young people in the spirit of communist ideology and loyalty to the cause and traditions of the workers class in a central position in work with young people. The task of forming in them firm Marxist-Leninist convictions, stability, political vigilance, ideological irreconcilability and an ability to stand up to the pernicious influence of bourgeois propaganda and so-called mass culture remains exceptionally relevant.

Comprehensively developing and strengthening in our young people a feeling of love for their socialist fatherland, pride in it, and readiness to loyally serve it, defend the achievements of socialism at any moment and give all their strength to consolidating their native country's economic and defense might is a necessary condition and most important prerequisite for the fulfillment of this task.

Educating the younger generation in the spirit of Soviet patriotism is one of the main tasks of ideological work set for the Komsomol by the party.

The party orients the Komsomol toward intensifying defense mass work and the military-patriotic education of young people and toward improving their training for service in the USSR Armed Forces. It has supported and achieved the broad spreading of many forms of this work that have arisen at the initiative of the Komsomol organizations. These juveniles, the search for and collection of materials on the feats of participants in the civil war and the Great Patriotic War, meetings with soldiers and veterans and patronal ties with military sectors. The Army Komsomol, the pivot of whose activities is directly implementing Lenin's behest "to learn military matters the real way" (Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 36, p 26), and ensuring the high combat readiness of the army and navy, also conducts a great deal of work to multiply the remarkable traditions of their fathers.

New possibilities are opening up before the military-patriotic education of young people in connection with the 40th anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism. The CPSU Central Committee resolution adopted in connection with this anniversary outlines a complex of measures for intensifying ideological-educational work, in the implementation of which the Komsomol organizations are also called upon to participate.

Together with the party and trade union organs, they must make full use of preparations for the 40th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War and the celebration of this anniversary, which is dear to us all, for the purpose of further increasing the working and political activeness of young Soviet people.

Establishing the ideas of Soviet patriotism in the awareness of young people is indivisible from educating them in the spirit of proletarian, socialist internationalism and friendship between the peoples of the USSR. The party activates the work of the Komsomol in this direction in every possible way. While relying upon the Komsomol, it strives so that the principles of internationalism are organically inherent in our way of life and so that the solidarity and cooperation between Soviet people and our young people and the fraternal socialist countries and peoples struggling for their social and national liberation is strengthened.

The Komsomol maintains ties with international and national youth and student organizations of various political orientations from 140 countries. The party attaches particular significance to developing and deepening comprehensive cooperation between the Komsomol and youth unions in fraternal socialist countries.

Uniting the efforts of young people the world over in the struggle for a stable world and against the threat of a thermonuclear war has become a burning task in the conditions of increased aggressiveness on the part of imperialism. The CPSU supports the Komsomol's initiatives, which are aimed at fulfilling this task. It has paid great attention to the decision adopted at the initiative of the Komsomol by the International Preparatory Committee to hold an ordinary 12th World Festival of Young People and Students in Moscow in the summer of 1985. The party and the Soviet government will give all possible assistance to the Komsomol in the holding of the festival as a mass antiwar and anti-imperialist undertaking so that it will be a major event in the International Youth Year. In addition to the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism and the World Festival, it is important to utilize other undertakings this year for the socialist community and for highlighting the political, economic and social achievements of real socialism, as well as the great potentials it possesses for the all-around development of the younger generations.

While adopting a comprehensive approach to educational work, the party believes that the ideological-political and work tempering of young people must be organically combined and merged into one with moral education. In this respect, the CPSU proceeds from the fact that the political and moral health of young people is not only predetermined by the level of ideological-educational work, but also by all social practice and the moral-political climate in the country, in every cell of society and in every labor collective.

At the very foundation of the Soviet system lies social justice and in this lies its great strength. That is why it is so important that the principles of social justice be steadily observed in everyday matters everywhere. Young people react particularly strongly to various instances of dishonorableness,

dishonesty and bureaucratism and to discrepancies between word and deed. By resolutely striving to eradicate phenomena of this kind, the party thereby greatly influences young people's outlook and assists the development within them of social optimism and social activeness. This, in turn, helps the Komsomol to increase the effectiveness of its work to educate young people in the spirit of communist morality and to be more successful in ensuring that young people in the Soviet Union are distinguished by moral purity and nobility and the aspiration to high ideals.

The aesthetic education of young people also merges with ideological-moral education. This work, which is unified in its aims, is conducted by the Komsomol both in the process of training and production and social activities and in the organization of young people's free time. Tireless concern is necessary to ensure that young men and women do not fall prey to empty amusements in their spare time and that all forms of leisure assist their ideological growth, physical development, the formation of high cultural needs and aesthetic tastes and their access to the best achievements of native and world culture.

The CPSU Central Committee places this responsibility primarily on the party and Komsomol organizations while demanding that they react promptly to young people's interests and that they give these interests the proper ideological and aesthetic direction, be it a question of music, songwriting, philately and so forth. While supporting in every possible way young people's striving for artistic and technical spontaneous creativity and for knowledge of the best examples of native and world literature and art, it is important to prevent indifference to politics, immorality and blind imitation of bourgeois fashion from creeping into young people's environment screened by amateur associations. This must be assisted in many ways by Komsomol workers personally participating in collective forms of leisure for young people.

The years of one's youth are not only years of study and of accustoming oneself to work; they are also a time when families are formed. The Komsomol organizations are called upon to persistently form in young people a responsible attitude to marriage and to the rearing of children and to propagandize the ideals of fatherhood and motherhood.

One great and responsible task which the party has set the Komsomol is that of drawing young people into both production and sociopolitical life and actively participating in the management of state and social affairs. Being an inalienable unit of the Soviet political system, the Komsomol does a great deal for the fulfillment of this task.

Komsomol members and young people are broadly represented in the organs of state power and administration and in various social organizations. Young people up to the age of 30 make up one-third of all Soviet deputies. The first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee is an elected member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Komsomol representatives are among the collegia of a number of ministries and departments, the USSR Committee of People's Control, the AUCCTU Presidium and the DOSAAF Central Committee Presidium.

More than 3.6 million young men and women are represented in elective trade union organs and 1.6 million Komsomol members in organs of the people's control. Komsomol members participate in drawing up plans for the economic and social development of labor collectives, in the work of permanent production conferences, in implementing control over the administration's observance of legislation relating to the protection of young labor, in allocating material incentives, apartments, passes to sanatoria and rest homes, places in kindergartens and creches and so forth.

At the same time, it should be said that the Komsomol could make considerably greater use of the extensive rights granted it by the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws in the management of the affairs of society and the state. It is important to concern ourselves with creating the conditions necessary for this and to support the Komsomol organizations' useful initiatives aimed at developing the sociopolitical activeness of young people. All vital problems concerning the training, work, everyday life and leisure of young people, the CPSU Central Committee points out, must definitely be resolved with the Komsomol's direct participation. The activeness of Komsomol members must also be further enhanced in the struggle to strengthen social order.

IV

The fulfillment of all the tasks which now face the Youth Union requires a fundamental improvement in the style of party leadership of the Komsomol and the style of work of the Komsomol itself. All CPSU Central Committee directives on the problems of youth policy are aimed at this. Party leadership of the Komsomol, the Central Committee emphasizes, must be of a systematic and systemic nature and must ensure energetic and purposeful activity on the part of all units of the Youth Union. An indispensable feature of this leadership is the ability to thoroughly analyze the social and ideological processes taking place in young people's environment and to influence them, as well as constant readiness to help the Komsomol organizations in their choice of the main directions and most effective forms of work. It is important in this respect to take into account the specific features of Komsomol work among different social groups of young people. Special attention must be devoted to young workers. It is precisely in them that the future of the workers class is embodied today. It is precisely through them that the best features of this class--the highest possible awareness, organization, discipline and collectivism--are transferred from generation to generation and increasingly become the property of all the people.

An obligatory requirement of the style of party leadership of the Komsomol is that communists influence Komsomol members and young people through conviction, show them the maximum of comradely attention, support their useful undertakings with interest and teach and educate them not by moralizing, but by joint work, and not only by word, but also by deed and personal example. In this connection, the party attaches particular significance to constant communication between party leaders and young people and to active participation by communists and all leading cadres in the ideological-political, work and moral education of the younger generation. They must systematically be wherever young people work, study and rest, take an interest

in how young people live and what troubles them, frankly and confidently talk with them on all matters and provide exhaustive answers to all questions. Political speeches by leaders to young workers and students and to active Komsomol members are an effective means of party influence upon the work of the Komsomol.

The party has always shown great concern for the ideological-political and organizational strengthening of the Komsomol and for the enhancing of its role and social prestige.

Thanks to party leadership, the Leninist Komsomol occupies a worthy place in our society as a school of education and a school of struggle for communist ideals. Several generations of Soviet people have already passed through this school.

The Komsomol fulfills the role of a reliable CPSU reserve with honor. Since it came into existence, almost 16 million Komsomol members have joined the party. Komsomol members now comprise approximately 73 percent of those accepted as candidate CPSU members. The party will also henceforth select the best Komsomol members for its ranks, primarily from among workers and kolhoz workers. The role of the Komsomol as a party reserve is also embodied in the fact that it is a good school for training cadres for party, state and social organizations. Tens of thousands of leading workers in these organizations acquired their first skills of working with people, as well as their political and organizational tempering, in the Komsomol. One-third of the first secretaries of the Central Committees of the communist parties of the union republics, kraykoms and obkoms have experience of leading Komsomol work.

Evidence of the Komsomol's high prestige among young people is the constant growth of its ranks. Over the last 20 years, the Komsomol has doubled in size. The Komsomol will grow even further, embracing increasingly broad masses of young people, but, of course, not by means of accepting all those who wish to be accepted without selection. A most important principle of Komsomol recruitment consists in the strictly individual selection of worthy representatives of young workers, rural workers, army members and students. In the course of all the Komsomol organizations' work with new recruits, the title of Komsomol member must be raised higher, a feeling of pride and responsibility for membership of the Union of Young Leninists must be cultivated and a readiness and ability to help the party build communism must be formed in every individual joining the Komsomol. The key to this not only lies in improving the practice of recruitment to the Komsomol, but mainly in its further organizational strengthening and in raising the level of all internal union work.

The CPSU Central Committee requires the party organs and the Komsomol committees to persistently strive to improve the style, forms and methods of Komsomol work and to create a lively, creative atmosphere in every Komsomol collective, an atmosphere filled with great social content and capable of captivating young men and women with the romance of lofty aims and interesting useful causes. This is all the more necessary in view of the fact that phenomena such as formalism and excessive paperwork, which undermine the spontaneous nature and broad democracy of the Youth Union, have recently crept

into Komsomol work. Excessive organization and specious sensationalism, as well as excessive enthusiasm for campaigns and marches calculated for effect and show, which are at times manifest in Komsomol activities, have a negative effect upon the education of young people.

Overcoming these shortcomings is a vital task of today. The party organizations are called upon to help the Komsomol in the fulfillment of this task. The matter must be brought to the point where the Komsomol increases organization, order and discipline in its ranks on the one hand, and develops the initiative and activeness of Komsomol members on the other. In this, as Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasizes, lies the essence of all measures to improve the style of Komsomol work.

Today it is particularly important for Komsomol workers to skillfully combine mass and individual forms of work among young men and women. One can say that the larger the youth union becomes and the greater the tasks it fulfills, the more important such an approach in the activities of its leaders becomes.

The center of gravity of internal union work is increasingly shifting directly into young people's collectives and into the lower units of the Komsomol, the primary organizations and Komsomol groups, where the education of young people is primarily and mainly conducted. Greater efficiency and concreteness and more interested attention to every young person--such is the requirement of life.

The responsibility of the Komsomol cadres is increasing a great deal in the new conditions. It is important that all Komsomol organizations are headed by true leaders capable of rallying and leading young people. Qualities of Komsomol leaders, such as ideological conviction and moral purity, organizational skill and an ability to react sensitively to the specific needs of young people and professional maturity and youthful fervor, have great significance.

The formation of the Komsomol cadres is a most important component of the party's cadre policy and requires the most serious and responsible attitude. That is why the CPSU Central Committee pays particular attention to work with the Komsomol cadres, regarding it as a decisive factor in intensifying the activities of the Youth Union and as one of the main aspects of party leadership of the Komsomol. The formation of the Komsomol aktiv and the selection and education of the leaders of Komsomol organizations must constantly be at the center of attention of the party committees.

Experience shows that it is expedient to promote young people with production experience who have passed through the school of the labor collective to leading work in the Komsomol. More women must be promoted to this work, care must be taken to ensure that representatives of all nationalities belonging to the Komsomol organization participate in this work and definite stability in the leading Komsomol aktiv must be achieved. It is important to ensure an optimum combination of workers, differing in their experience and age, both old hands and beginners, in the Komsomol committees at all levels.

Communists are the backbone of the Komsomol cadres and the core of the Komsomol. The CPSU consistently pursues a policy aimed at strengthening the party core in the Komsomol and enhancing its role in the union's activities. Over the last 17 years, the number of communists working in the Komsomol has increased more than 5.6 fold and now totals 1.5 million.

Of course, a purely quantitative growth in the party core does not in itself lead to an intensification of party leadership of the Komsomol. It is not simply a matter of how many communists are present in the youth union, but of how they work and actually influence its life and activities. The CPSU Central Committee believes that a communist's work in the Komsomol is responsible party work and must be fulfilled with honor. The party organs are called upon to assist this in every possible way, to guide the daily activities of young communists and to take care that every young communist wins high prestige among Komsomol members and young people by his selflessness in labor, ideological conviction and irreproachable personal conduct.

It has become the practice to hold rayon and city conferences of communists working in the Komsomol, to hear their accountability reports in the primary party organizations and to elect secretaries of Komsomol organizations to the staff of the party committees and bureaus. At present, almost two-thirds of the first secretaries of the Komsomol raykoms, gorkoms, obkoms and kraykoms enter the bureaus of the party rayon, city, oblast and kray committees. The CPSU Central Committee deems it necessary to also develop this practice, which contributes to intensifying party leadership of the Komsomol.

The party devotes a great deal of attention to comprehensively training Komsomol cadres. A great deal is done through the extensive network of party and Komsomol schools and courses. While attaching great significance to the political education of Komsomol workers, the CPSU Central Committee has deemed it necessary to broaden their training in the higher party academic institutions and in the Higher Komsomol School under the Komsomol Central Committee.

The practice of socialist construction convinces us that work with young people can yield greater results when it is conducted not only by the party and Komsomol, but also by all cells of society and every sector of its political system. Proceeding from this, the CPSU regards the education of the younger generation as a most important party, state and national cause. This cause must be constantly engaged in by all state, economic and social organizations, labor collectives, and schools. The party organs are called upon to coordinate their efforts in this matter.

The role of the soviets of people's deputies and of their permanent commissions on work with young people is great in comprehensively resolving problems of young people's work, everyday life and leisure. More than 11,000 such commissions now operate. Commissions on work with young people are also found in a number of ministries and departments and also in the trade union organs. Their activities are and will continue to be the focus of the party organs' unremitting attention, these organs striving to ensure that the aforementioned activities become more substantive and take the vital needs of young people more fully into account.

It is well known how greatly literature and art influence the formation of young people's world outlook and moral character. Consequently, the party attaches great significance to organizing the developing close cooperation between the creative unions and Komsomol for the purposes of intensifying the ideological, moral and aesthetic education of young people. The Union of Writers and the Komsomol Central Committee enjoy effective forms of this type of cooperation. These are: conferences of young writers, the mass weeks of children's books annually held in the country and reviews of school essays on patriotic and moral themes. Theater and cinema art broadly serve the education of the younger generation. Recognized masters of culture and talented representatives of the creative intelligentsia are actively drawn into creating literature and art for young people.

All this has a positive effect upon the Komsomol's work with young people. But today, as required by the party, new efforts are needed to ensure the higher quality and higher ideological and artistic level of productions dealing with youth themes and to increase the responsibility of cultural institutions and creative organizations for this.

A graphic example of the party's and state's constant concern for the education of the younger generations is the school reform, which is being practically implemented throughout the country at the present time. Reflecting the party's strategy in the sphere of the people's education, the reform's aim is to radically improve the working education and professional orientation of students on the basis of combining training with productive labor. It develops the Leninist ideas on the unified working polytechnical school appropriate to contemporary conditions.

Implementation of the reform requires substantial improvement in Komsomol activities in schools and in our Pioneer Organization. They must show the maximum of initiative and spontaneous activity in order to serve as a reliable support for the pedagogical collectives in work to improve the quality of the academic-educational process. The work of the Komsomol production organizations, which have patronage over schools, vocational-technical institutes and Pioneer detachments, must also be activated in connection with the reform.

Great are the tasks and varied are the forms and methods of work with young people in the conditions of developed socialism. And today, whatever aspects of this work we take, the practice of party leadership of the education of young people must be further perfected and Komsomol, the state, economic and trade union organizations and the broad public must be even more actively relied upon. So our party acts.

The CPSU's historical experience irrefutably testifies that young people are capable of playing a truly revolutionary role when they act under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party and in indissoluble unity with the workers class and the working masses for the sake of the lofty aims of the communist transformation of society. The contemporary practice of socialist construction also attests to this. It shows that party leadership of the youth movement is a prime condition and most important guarantee of the

revolutionary continuity of generations in socialist society, as well as a guarantee of the Komsomol's moral fiber, militancy and creative activeness.

Educating young people in the communist spirit and intensifying party influence upon the activities of the youth unions is one of those common problems having topical significance for all the fraternal parties of the socialist countries. The ordinary Conference of Secretaries of the Central Committees of Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist Countries studying Problems of Organizational-Party Work, which was held in Sofia at the end of May, was dedicated to mutual study of their accumulated experience in resolving this problem. The participants in the conference unanimously noted the permanent significance of Leninist ideas and principles of work with young people for all countries following a path of building socialism and communism. They emphasized that creative utilization of the fraternal parties' accumulated experience in educating the younger generations and in leading the young unions would serve to further strengthen the socialist community and would ensure it new successes in forming a progressive social system. Our Leninist party makes and will also henceforth continue to make its own contribution to the common cause, with which the fate of world socialism is connected.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/1

DISPUTE ON THE BASICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 23-33

[Article by USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member T. Timofeyev]

[Text] The Year of Marx proved with particular clarity the tremendous influence of the immortal ideas of socialism in all continents and the correctness and vitality of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the classes and the class struggle and the laws of the global revolutionary process. The communists also know that the penetration of these ideas in the minds of the masses takes place in the course of the struggle against reactionary bourgeois ideology, which has long been noted for its unprincipled attacks on the progressive outlook of the working class.

The opponents of scientific communism spare no efforts in their attempts to prove the "groundlessness" or "obsolescence," i.e., the inapplicability of the doctrine of Marx-Engels-Lenin under 20th-century conditions. The supporters of primitive anticommunism, including the contemporary propagandists of "neoconservatism," are openly joining the "crusade" against scientific socialism. Today both U.S. President Reagan and the Western European neofascist thugs are calling for energizing the "struggle for the refutation of Marxism" and the ideas of communism. Some of the Western ideologues, who are preaching the thesis of the "crisis" of classical Marxism, insist on its "global reinterpretation," naturally while appealing for a rejection of its most important concepts and conclusions. A similar position is held essentially by some revisionist-leaning "neo-Marxists," who call for "changing Marxism itself."

In what direction would these newly hatched "refuters" and pseudo-interpreters of Marxist theory like to "change it?"

They would like above all to emasculate its revolutionary nature and direction. In order to achieve this, however, they are forced to reject the most profound, the initial methodological foundations of Marxism and the fundamental categories and concepts of Marxist political economy, dialectical and historical materialism and scientific communism. It is natural therefore that bourgeois and reformist "Marxology" distorts to an incredible extent universally familiar historical and socioeconomic facts which identify the true origin and class nature of the revolutionary outlook of the proletariat,

the correlation among its basic sources and the structural parts and laws governing the continuity of the creative development of its integral revolutionary theory.

It would be no exaggeration to point out that the misrepresentation of a process, such as the establishment and development of the basic Marxist conclusion of the universal-historical role of the working class, i.e., precisely what V. I. Lenin described as the main feature of Marx's theory (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 1) plays a central role in these subversive efforts. Therefore, the study of the Marxist concept of the revolutionary-transforming and constructive mission of the working class is of basic scientific and ideological-political significance.

This concept played a cementing, a key role in the development of Marx's entire theoretical system. On the other hand, it was the subsequent development of Marxism itself that became inseparably related to the growth of the working class and its activeness. In considering the question of the interaction between revolutionary theory and practice we must also take into consideration the fact that it is a question of integral Marxism, which is being developed and applied creatively under changing historical conditions.

Some Western bourgeois-reformist "Marxologists," who claims to accept Marx's scientific merits (basically in terms of the past, of 19th century conditions), in fact would like to borrow from Marxism, as was the case with their ideological predecessors, only that "which is acceptable to the liberal bourgeoisie," rejecting "'merely' the living heart of Marxism and 'merely' its revolutionism" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 26, p 227).

They have been doing this for quite some time and through a variety of means; references to the "unknown Marx" while, in fact, to their own rather arbitrary interpretations of Marx's theory, has become particularly "popular" of late. It was in this connection that a series of works on the topic of "Marx as a critic (!) of Marxism" appeared in the West. Its authors and compilers (which include Maximilian Rubel and like-minded people) interpret Marx's legacy in the spirit of some kind of abstract, nonclass "ethical" and neo-anarchic doctrines, promoting "their own interpretation of Marx."

In its efforts to prove the "inadequacy" of integral Marxism in our time in this manner, bourgeois propaganda distorts particularly energetically the real processes of development of the working class, thus belittling or misrepresenting the theory of its historical mission. This operation is taking place in several directions. This includes the intention of eliminating differences between the views of Marx on the proletariat and some pre-Marxian doctrines; the line of "dismembering" integral Marxism by artificially pitting Engels against Marx and Marx himself...against Marxism and belittling Lenin's contribution to the creative development of revolutionary Marxism. Particular efforts are made to give a false interpretation to the relationship between the working class and its conscious revolutionary vanguard.

Let us begin with the misinterpretation of the basic problems of the origins of Marx's theory. In ignoring the utopian and immature features of pre-

Marxian concepts relative to the "worker problem," and ignoring the true socialist prerequisites for the appearance of scientific proletarian socialism, such people usually seek its roots in some escatological, religious-mystical "psychographic" aspects and ideas. They try to reduce everything to the "purely ethical" origins of Marxism, seeing its nature only in its compassion, pity for the poor and the pauperized strata, without burdening themselves with an analysis of the laws governing the real growth of the proletariat and the labor movement. Furthermore, if we were to believe M. Rubel, for example (whose views are shared by a number of bourgeois philosophers and historians in the old and new worlds), in the first half of the 1840s, when Marx's concept of the universal historical mission of the proletariat took shape, Marx's views allegedly followed the channel of bourgeois-liberal ideas.

Yet, as we know, matters were quite different. During the first half of the 1940s the young Marx had already converted from idealism to materialism and from revolutionary democratism to communism. Having profoundly studied universal history (as confirmed by his "Kreutznach Notebooks" of 1843, which include, in particular, extensive excerpts from many works on the history of France, England, the United States and other countries and the history of the French Revolution), Marx did not idealize bourgeois democracy in the least. He exposed its hypocrisy and limitations. Furthermore, pointing out that it is precisely the private ownership system that links the various types of bourgeois states with each other, Marx emphasized that in this sense the difference in their forms does not affect their essence or their class or nature. "The dispute between the monarchy and the republic," he wrote, "remains a dispute within the boundaries of an abstract state.... Ownership and so on or, in a word, the entire content of the law and the state, is with few differences, very much the same in the United States and in Prussia. Consequently, the republic in the United States is merely the state form as the monarchy is here. The content of the state is outside the framework of these forms of governmental system" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 1, pp 253-254).

The question is how to depict Marx as supporter of liberal-bourgeois concepts or, specifically, as a supporter and "follower" of bourgeois ideologues such as de Tocqueville and Hamilton, if the latter justified the role of private property while the great founder of scientific communism, directly opposed to them, firmly condemned a system in which the bourgeoisie was supporting its self-seeking interests? In summing up the experience of world history, the young Marx was already fully aware of the importance of understanding precisely the type of class whose specific interests could coincide with the universal will and that it was the proletariat which was precisely that class. In the course of reaching this essential conclusion, he criticized the conclusions of those, including de Tocqueville and Hamilton, who had greatly idealized the exploiting system and dampened its social contradictions. That is precisely why the founders of scientific communism classified such ideologues of the liberal bourgeoisie as "God-made philistines" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 37, p 125; vol 1, pp 387-388, 390; vol 2, p 204; vol 26, part I, p 258).

It is no accident that it is precisely in Marx's works where the idea of the universal historical mission of the working class was formulated and developed that it was substantiated in the course of sharp arguments against a variety of bourgeois and petit bourgeois antiproletarian doctrines. This was a manifestation of the dialectical interaction between the critical and the revolutionary sides and polemic and constructive aspects characteristic of Marx's world outlook. Thus, in the articles published in the GERMAN-FRENCH YEARBOOK, which included Marx's familiar work "On the Critique of Hegelian Philosophy of the Law. An Introduction" (written between the end of 1843 and January 1844), the critical consideration of the political conclusions of Hegelianism (aimed at justifying the "existing order") was combined with a study of the existing prerequisites for the implementation of the "positive possibilities" of the future emancipation of society. In this connection, Marx directly addressed himself to the proletariat which was being born and developing as a result of expanding industrial progress (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 1, pp 427-428). In referring to the objectively determined leading role of the historically ascending class, he emphasized that "no single class in a civilian society can play this role without triggering...enthusiasm within itself and among the masses.... This class fraternizes and blends with the entire society when...it is accepted and acknowledged as its universal representative; ...when the specific aspirations and rights of this class truly become the rights and aspirations of society itself, when it truly represents the social mind and the social heart.... In order for the revolution of the people and the emancipation of an individual class in a civilian society coincide...all shortcomings of the society must be concentrated in another class. This specific class must become the embodiment of the common obstacles, the embodiment of all common obstructions.... In order for a class to be the liberating class par excellence, the other must, conversely, be obviously an enslaving class" (ibid., pp 425-426). Marx further pointed out that it is precisely the proletariat which demands the "rejection of private ownership" (ibid., p 428). Subsequently, in highly assessing Marx's work of that period, including his publications in the GERMAN-FRENCH YEARBOOK, Lenin could with full justification emphasize that in these articles "Marx presents himself as a revolutionary who has proclaimed a 'merciless criticism of everything extant' and, particularly, 'criticism of weapons,' appealing to the masses and the proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 26, pp 47-48).

The continuing development of the various aspects of Marx's concept of the historical mission of the proletariat was also reflected in the "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844." In intensifying his criticism of the capitalism system, Marx identified in them the nature of the alienation of labor, inherent in this exploiting society and here again arguing both against the Hegelian philosophers (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 42, pp 43, 152-174), as well as against a number of bourgeois economists. In this work Marx points out the historical doom of capitalism. The fact that Marx's conversion from idealism to materialism and from revolutionary-democratic views to communism had become total can be confirmed not only by Marx's study of the development of contradictions between labor and capital but the profound substantiation of the thesis to the effect that the "emancipation of society from private ownership, etc., and from slavery, will develop into the political form of emancipation of the workers. In this case it is not merely

a matter of the emancipation of the workers, for emancipation includes "the emancipation of mankind," for which reason the "positive elimination of private property," as an assertion of human life, means the positive elimination of all alienation..." (ibid., pp 98, 117). Already then Marx proclaimed that in order to eliminate the private ownership system "in real life a real communist influence will be required," predicting that "history will bring with itself this communist action" (ibid., p 136).

Therefore, Marx reached the conclusion of the universal historical role of the proletariat at a time when it had appeared on the stage of history and when its struggle against capitalism was becoming increasingly intensive. This struggle which began, as Marx pointed out, with the very appearance of capitalist relations (op. cit., vol 23, p 438), subsequently developed with the growth of the factory-plant proletariat under the conditions of the industrial revolution. As capitalism developed the processes which contributed to the unification and organization of the industrial proletariat into a class, its establishment as a revolutionary force, the growth of labor actions and the birth of a politically autonomous proletarian movement intensified. Consequently, Marx's conclusions were not speculative but were based on objective processes, trends and prospects of development of the proletariat and the growth of the labor movement.

It was natural for Marx to pay such great attention to the study of the real experience of the mass actions of the proletariat and the worker uprisings in France, England and Germany in the 1830s-1840s. In the analysis of their nature, development and consequences Marx ascribed particular importance to the fact that "immediately, with striking clarity, sharply and uncereemoniously, the proletariat powerfully and loudly proclaimed that it is opposed to a private ownership society." In this connection Marx wrote that "...the outcome of the French and English uprisings will enable us to determine the nature of the proletariat" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 1, p 443).

The idea of the leading role of the proletariat in the struggle against exploitative private ownership (along with a fuller criticism of petit bourgeois and other nonproletarian social doctrines) was subsequently provided in a number of works by Marx and Engels. He proved that the objectives and the "historical cause of the proletariat anticipate most clearly and irrevocably its status in life as well as the entire organization of contemporary bourgeois society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 2, p 40). The conclusion of the sociohistorical mission of the working class was reflected in an even more complete form in Marx's and Engels' "German Ideology" (1845-1846). It was comprehensively substantiated by Marx in his "Poverty of Philosophy" (1847) and subsequently in the "Communist Party Manifesto," which he coauthored with Engels.

Consequently, the establishment and development of Marx's concept of the historical mission of the proletariat took place under conditions when the contradictions within bourgeois society had become quite clearly apparent and a politically independent worker movement was being started.

The accuracy of Marx's doctrine was clearly confirmed by the main trends in the development of the working class and its struggle and the global revolutionary movement during the 19th century. Particularly convincing proof of its viability in the 20th century was the victory of the Great October Revolution and the confrontation between the two world systems, the growth of the revolutionary worker and mass anti-imperialist movements on different continents and the development of the global revolutionary process. "It was thus that scientific socialism created by Marx blended with the live practical activities of millions of working people building a new society" ("Karl Marks i Sovremennost'" [Karl Marx and Contemporaneity], Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, p 7).

The misrepresentation of these unquestionable accomplishments and irreversible universal historical accomplishments of the victorious working class is one of the main trends in the anti-Marxist efforts not only of frenzied anticommunists but also, to one extent or another, by "Marxologists" holding reformists or left-doctrinairian "neo-Trotskyite" positions. As a rule, the latter tend to belittle the international significance of the successes of real socialism and its influence on global social development. They misinterpret the main social antagonism of our epoch by claiming that it is not the development of contradictions between socialism and imperialism and between the working class and the bourgeoisie which are the sources of revolutionary changes in the world but uncontrolled actions of declassed lumpen proletarian strata, particularly in the liberated countries.

Unlike the various petit bourgeois nonproletarian doctrines, Marxism shows a true understanding of the universality of social processes and inaccurately analyzes the motive forces of the world revolutionary movement and the entire set of processes which determine "the transformation of history into world history" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 3, p 45). The objective possibilities of the ascending development of mankind, including the growth of the proletariat, the broadening of the scale of its struggle, the ripening of conditions for the victory and implementation of revolutionary social changes by it develop, the founders of scientific communism emphasized, as a result of the effect of a number of factors, including the development on an international scale of "production forces and related world intercourse.... The proletariat can exist...only in the universal-historical sense of the word" (ibid., pp 34, 35). In the struggle for strengthening the international revolutionary movement of the working class and for its successful interaction with its allies it would be hard to overestimate the tremendous consequences of the implementation of the principles of international proletarian solidarity substantiated by scientific socialism. Furthermore, if we ignore or underestimate the international significance of the experience of real socialism in our epoch today it would be generally impossible to understand the truly universal nature of Marxism and the universal scale organically inherent in it.

Marxism, Lenin emphasized, is a "Marxian system of views and theories characterized by noteworthy consistency and purposefulness" (op. cit., vol 26, p 50). It is precisely on such a systematic and purposeful base that its fundamental concept is founded according to which the conversion of capitalist society into a socialist one is inevitable and that the proletariat, trained

by capitalism itself, is the intellectual and moral booster, the physical executor of this conversion" (ibid., p 73).

The scientific outlook of the communists demands precisely the integral and comprehensive consideration of the ways leading to the practical implementation of the historical mission of the working class, taking into consideration changing objective conditions and the specific historical methods for the implementation of its leading role in the reorganization of society.

This presumes the proper assessment of the international significance of the Leninist stage in the creative development of Marxism and the practical application of the revolutionary theory of proletarian parties of a new type. This also includes paying close attention to the most important manifestations of the revolutionary-transforming and constructive role of the victorious working class organized as a government and the development by its Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the theory and practice of scientific socialism. It is a question of determining the prerequisites and ways of the international influence of the working class in the countries within the socialist commonwealth, acting as the leading force in world social progress and as the bulwark of all anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces in the struggle for rescuing the peoples from the threat of thermonuclear war and in resolving other global problems and as a guarantor in rescuing the civilization of mankind today, contrary to the imperialist policies.

Meanwhile, the enemies of the communist movement are launching particularly fierce attacks precisely with a view to discrediting integral Marxism. This includes the efforts of some Western authors (who claim that integral Marxism has little in common with the views of Marx himself) to inspire the latest propaganda campaign under the false slogan "Yes to Marx But No to Marxism" (?!). Its initiators would like to prove the "incompatibility between the works of Marx and that which is known as Marxism." This includes the dissemination of concepts of a "third way," the purpose of which is to emasculate the revolutionary nature of the Marxist doctrine and, furthermore, to pit its theoretical principles against the features of real socialism.

As to the new phenomena in global social developments, on which the newly hatched "critics" of revolutionary theory are trying to speculate particularly zealously, they not only do not refute but conversely, again and again, clearly confirm the accuracy of the fundamental conclusions of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The working class, Marx and Engels pointed out, goes through various development stages, determined by a number of factors.

On the one hand, they include changes in production tools and related changes in production relations, which under capitalism mean increased exploitation of hired labor.¹

On the other hand Marxism has never considered the proletariat merely "an object of influence by external factors," not to mention as some kind of "passive" social force. Conversely, the Marxists see in it an active subject

and a leading force of sociohistorical progress and it is in this connection that they study the laws of the class struggle, the prerequisites and phases of growth of the consciousness of the working class and the conditions, forms of maturing and establishment of this path in a hegemonistic position in the revolutionary struggle against the exploiting system.

These clear scientific principles governing class analysis are the methodological foundation for a proper assessment of the consequences of the type of objective economic processes and scientific and technical changes which influence the position of the working class and affect the structure of the army of hired labor, the awareness and socioeconomic and political requirements of the working people and the level of their class, antimonopoly and antiwar struggle.

How are these scientific principles subjected today to the attacks of bourgeois "Marxologists" and various types of theoreticians of reformist "neo-Marxism"?

Above all, efforts are made to dispute the scientific definition of classes itself and the most important criteria of class affiliation. A number of bourgeois sociologists reject in general the accuracy of the scientific category of "proletariat." Another group of authors, reformist in particular, although using this concept, interpret it in a subjectivistic and nonhistorical manner, unrelated to the state of production relations. The "neo"-revisionist ideologues particularly oppose the conclusion of the decisive significance of the position held by the proletariat within the public production system or, in other words, the main criterion of its class affiliation.

Another group of "critics" of scientific communism proclaims Marx's concept of the leading role of the working class in the struggle for social progress as being applicable not to our but to other historical periods preceding the contemporary scientific and technical revolution. This thesis is intensively promoted not only by right-wing opportunistic ideologues but by Markusians and supporters of "left-wing doctrinaire" "neo"-anarchic and other petit bourgeois concepts. "Marx and Engels," writes, for example, American economist Paul Sweezy, "were right in their assessments of the revolutionary potential of the early industrial proletariat.... Marxist ideology was based on the experience of the proletariat which arose as a result of the industrial revolution of the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century." "Today, however, a century after Marx's death," they claim, "there are no sensible grounds to assume that the main idea of Marxism has been confirmed, i.e., the stipulation that the proletariat is called upon to become the agent of revolutionary change in the developed capitalist countries" (MONTHLY REVIEW, No 10, vol 34, March 1983, p 6).

As a rule, such concepts which provide the basic conclusions of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, are structured on stereotypes and repeatedly debunked myths of the "erosion" or "disappearance" of the proletariat as a result of the consequences of the latest scientific and technical changes. "The microelectronic revolution," claims, in particular, the French sociologist Andre Gorz, "initiates the era of the elimination of labor" (A. Gorz, "Les

Chemins du Paradis" [The Roads to Paradise], Paris, 1983, p 73). He is seconded by Alain Touraine, who proclaims the theory of scientific socialism obsolete, claiming that the antagonism between labor and capital has been replaced (instead of, as he claims, "the declining socialist ideology" and the class struggle) by a qualitatively basic new contradiction essentially aimed at the "struggle against technocracy" (A. Touraine, "L'apres-socialisme" [After Socialism]. Paris, 1980, pp 261-262).

One of the quite widespread means of distorting Marx's theory of the working class by his "critics" was manifested here once again. These critics are trying to speculate on the fact that the creator of "Das Kapital" focused his main attention on relations between overall capital and labor, most frequently reducing the latter to simple average manpower and in the majority of cases deliberately abstracting himself from the processes relative to its enhanced complexity. However, such anti-Marxist speculations are totally groundless. To begin with, Marx needed such a reduction in order to identify in its pure aspect the very essence of the process of extraction of capitalist profits. Secondly, Marx repeatedly pointed out the erroneousness of efforts to reduce the entire working class merely to the type of worker engaged in simple physical labor. He pointed out that complex labor is "a manifestation of the type of manpower the training of which demands higher costs" and which enjoys "higher value than simple manpower. If the value of this force is higher, it is manifested in terms of higher level of labor and therefore materialized in equal time intervals in relatively higher values" (op. cit., vol 23, pp 208-209). Thirdly, this applies even more so to the contemporary phase in production development when the need for complex manpower has become even greater. Changes in the numerical structure and the share of the individual detachments of the working class (such as the increased share of highly skilled workers engaged in "science-intensive" production sectors and reduction of the agricultural proletariat in a number of countries and increased share of commercial-office workers) do not prove in the least any reduction but, conversely, show a growth of the working class and an increase in its role, including worker strata related to the development of production forces and the most promising trends of scientific-technical and social progress. In the imperialist countries, processes which reflect the growth of the capitalist socialization of production, have increased the size of the hired labor army and broadened the area of exploitation.

Naturally, this circumstance has worsened the gravity of the question which was formulated and basically resolved by the Marxist classics of achieving an accurate understanding of the nature of the category of the working class itself and, on the practical level, ensuring the unity among its individual detachments. In cautioning the efforts against the efforts by the bourgeoisie and various types of nonproletarian petit bourgeois ideologues to divide the various detachments of the working people also on the basis of purely professional and other characteristics, Marx wrote that "in no case are class differences based on 'craft'; conversely, the division of labor creates different types of labor within the same class" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 4, p 310).

These and other Marxian stipulations were a reliable methodological foundation, on the one hand, for the proper and comprehensive study of the

shifts which are taking place in the social structure of bourgeois society through the 20th century as well and in the composition of the working class itself and, at the same time, for providing a properly argued scientific criticism of the concepts of the old and new "defamers" of Marx (from E. Bernstein, W. Sombart and G. Kunov to R. Darendorf, A. Bier and I. Hirsch today). In refuting such doctrines about a "new middle class," a "new petite bourgeoisie" and the "disappearance" of the working class, the Marxists cautioned both against the unjustified and artificial narrowing of the boundaries identifying the proletariat as well as their equally groundless, endless expansion.

However, the monopoly bourgeoisie links many of its hopes precisely to the various lines separating and demarcating among individuals doing hired labor. Whereas in the past it relied primarily on differences between hired workers in performing physical and nonphysical labor, today the monopolies try to cultivate for their own selfish interests a competition among the different proletarian strata (employ , for example, at enterprises created by the cosmopoliticized financial-industrial oligarchy in the developing countries and at enterprises in countries where multinational corporations are based). Monopoly capital uses to an equal extent differences in the status and the moral and psychological condition and immediate requirements of unemployed or workers in the old "traditional" skills, on the one hand, who are being pushed out of the production process as a result of economic restructuring and the installation of labor-saving equipment and, on the other, categories of workers with a higher skill, employed in expanding sectors (such as electronics, microelectronics, or industry enterprises, etc.). Some of them, in the United States, England and the FRG, for example, particularly under the conditions of the aggravation of crisis processes and the intensification of the military psychosis by the ruling circles in those countries, have indicated that they have been influenced to a certain extent by the reactionary propaganda and the ideas of "class cooperation" it cultivates. This has influenced their electoral behavior as well. In national elections in recent years, in a number of cases a certain percentage of hired workers have supported the conservative parties. However, the major success achieved by the Italian Communist Party at the recently held elections for the European Parliament confirmed the instability of this trend.

Unquestionably, the working people and their organizations in the capitalist world are facing a number of complex problems. They are caused by the further concentration of economic power in the hands of the monopolies, the expansion of big capital, the new role played by the huge multinational corporations, the increased influence of the military-industrial complex and the increased reactionary and aggressive trends in contemporary imperialist policy. Nor should we ignore the fact that the entrepreneurs have energized their antilabor actions in an effort, among other things, to profit from the increased scale of unemployment in undermining the positions of the organized labor movement and benefit for the same purpose from the results of the growing internationalization of economic life and the technological restructuring of the production process.

However, it would be entirely erroneous to consider on the basis of such phenomena that the "twilight of the working class" and its "historical sunset"

have taken place and that henceforth the proletariat could be considered merely as a splintered, futureless social group which has been weakened (not only as a result of the pressure of the class enemy but also of its inner quarrels and contradictions) and that it is unable through its struggle to have a positive influence on the development of society and the course of world events.

Thus, some of the new "reinterpreters" of Marxism are preaching the thesis of the radical "transformation" of the proletariat under the conditions of the increased internationalization of the economy and related changes in the international division of labor. The authors of the monograph "Divided Work and Divided Workers," a monograph recently published in the United States, discussed the "historical transformation" of the working class and singled out three main stages in its development: (1) initial proletarianization (to the end of the 19th century); (2) "homogenization of labor" (from the end of the 19th century to the end of the 1930s); (3) the "segmenting" of the manpower (which includes the postwar period as well). Calling for a "corrected" and "reformulated" reevaluation of the conclusions of "traditional Marxist analysis," they claim that the processes of proletariat consolidation have fallen behind and that today the proletariat is experiencing a period of decline.

This can be claimed only by people who are unable to see above all the historical future. The rich experience of the global revolutionary process teaches us to consider the working class and the proletarian movement as a dynamic international phenomenon. In the course of its progress the proletarian movement has frequently experienced periods of ebb and flow. It has experienced periods of difficulties and failures followed by new major successes. In all complex reversals in the international class confrontation the supporters of socialism have remained historical optimists. Their revolutionary optimism is based not on any blind faith but on a truly scientific Marxist-Leninist world outlook. One of its main fundamental conclusions is precisely the concept that the working class is a necessary creation of the socioeconomic development of society which creates, organizes and strengthens the proletariat on the basis of historical inevitability.

Something else is equally essential.

Noting the fact of the "segmentation" of the manpower, which may be considered, so to say, as lying on the surface and, on the basis of this, reaching the hasty conclusion of the breakdown and decline of the proletariat as a class is a typical example of vulgar bourgeois thinking. The word "segmentation," with its clearly negative shade of meaning, its tendentiously "used" in describing a process which, in reality, confirms the intensive and even tempestuous quantitative and qualitative growth of the working class and the inclusion of new strata and detachments of hired labor within its ranks. Let us emphasize that these processes occur not only within the national framework of individual countries; they also have their international or, more precisely, universal dimension. It is precisely during the past 50 to 60 years that tremendous changes have taken place in the development of the global proletariat and that the traditional ("homogeneous") proletariat in the capitalist countries has been reinforced by powerful and growing detachments

such as the socialist working class and the proletariat in the developing countries. Could a conclusion on the breakdown and decline of the working class be drawn from this fact?

Furthermore, the tricks of the antiproletarian ideologues also contain a certain charge of divisive demagogy and speculative distortion of the inevitably complex process of development of the working class which has its internal dialectics. Bourgeois philosophy deliberately (more accurately, maliciously) seeks cracks and divisions in proletariat ranks and, naturally, looks for them wherever the lines of true demarcation and objectively conflicting situation of the working class in capitalist conditions pass. Need one be reminded of the fact that the acknowledgment and understanding of this contradictoriness is an essential, a basic Marxist truth?

In terms of contemporary conditions it means above all a sharp contradiction between the role which the working class has assumed in the public production system and the oppressed and exploited situation in which capitalism continues to keep it within its own social relations system.

This conflict is reflected in the structure of the working class, which is developing as a complex social community of exploited mental and physical workers in all realms of the economy, surrounded, furthermore, by a number of transitional groups which have reached different stages of proletarianization but which sometimes experience the influence of other tangential or even opposite trends.

Furthermore, it affects the most important parameters of its economic status. It leads to a crisis of unemployment, which reflects the growth of a structural disproportionality and affects its living standard which falls behind its growing needs.

It is manifested particularly sharply in the contemporary system of labor exploitation, which combines the latest methods based on the use of complex labor as well as the predatory exhaustion of the manpower through "traditional" means which are inseparable from capitalism.

Finally, the development of the social mentality of the working class and its proletarian class awareness is conflicting as well; despite all the efforts made by the bourgeoisie to implant social pessimism in terms of the class struggle, it is ripening and entering into an open conflict with the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism, as tangibly confirmed by the experience of the class struggle under the conditions of the aggravation of its general crisis (including the experience in the latest stubborn class battles and actions by the proletariat in Great Britain, the FRG, Italy, France and other countries.

It is precisely the Marxists who deem it their scientific and class duty to expose and show to the proletariat the true contradictoriness of its status under the conditions of bourgeois domination, above all in order scientifically to substantiate the unity of its class objectives in the struggle for the overthrow of bourgeois domination regardless of the characteristics of the situation prevailing in its different detachments and in order scientifically to prove and to indicate to the proletariat the

in order scientifically to prove and to indicate to the proletariat the powerful potential of its growth, which contains within itself the contradictions of its status and development.

One of the most important and basic Marxist conclusions is that "...the proletariat...does not attend a harsh labor training school for nothing. The point is not what an individual proletarian or even the entire proletariat considers as the objective at any given moment. The point is what the proletariat actually is and what, accordingly, it must historically accomplish" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 2, p 40).

The main trends and results in the development of the universal historical process during the century which has elapsed since Marx's death have convincingly confirmed the accuracy of the main, the determining conclusions of scientific socialism regarding the exploitative nature and historical doom of the capitalist production method. Neither old nor new "topplers" of Marxist doctrine have been able to refute the theory of added value or Marx's conclusions on the law of the social polarization of bourgeois society, the concept of the proletariat's assumption of a position of hegemony in global social progress or the Marxist-Leninist theory of the laws of conversion to socialism and the development of a socialist society.

The radical distinction between the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and the various elaborations of reformist and quasi-Marxist ideologues is, in addition to everything else, that scientific socialism is based not on neglecting or "smoothing over" social contradictions but, conversely, on their dialectical interpretation and comprehensive utilization in the interest of the most progressive social force--the working class and its communist vanguard.

FOOTNOTES

1. In accordance with the main stages in the development of machine production, which were extensively analyzed by Marx in "Das Kapital," differences were noted also between the following: (1) the proletariat of the period of "simple cooperation" or "cooperation among many homogeneous machines"; (2) the proletariat of the age of capitalist manufacturing, characterized by a "combination of partial working machinery"; (3) the factory-plant working class in the various stages of large-scale machine production. As to the working class in the assembly line and, subsequently, assembly line automated production, such development stages took place essentially in the 20th century. Nevertheless, already then, more than a century ago, Marx perspicaciously pointed out the inevitability of the advent of a stage in worker labor under the conditions of a higher form of machine system, i.e., an "automated system of machines" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, pp 289-393). This took into consideration all factors which, put together, determine changes in the working class composition.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/1

KARL MARX ON THE INDIVIDUAL'S CONDITIONS FOR HIS LIBERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 34-44

[Article by G. Smirnov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The theory of the individual is not merely one of the sections of Marxism-Leninism but something more than that. Essentially, the entire Marxist theory of the revolutionary reorganization of society, based on the discovery of its objective historical laws, is nothing other than a scientifically substantiated program for the liberation of the working person and the comprehensive development of the individual. That is precisely why the Marxist-Leninist theory of the individual has been a steady target of bourgeois ideological attacks.

The critics of communism sometimes claim that in general the Marxists pay no proper attention to the problem of the individual and his freedom and creative activeness. The Marxists, however, have no need to "rehabilitate" themselves in the eyes of world public opinion on this matter, for a profoundly scientific concept of the individual was developed by the founders of their doctrine.

Karl Marx considers the individual, his essence and his liberation and development as inseparably linked with society. It is not the individual but society which he takes as the starting point in his analysis. According to Marxism, the basic motive reasons governing the actions of large masses of people, entire nations and, within them, classes, ~~are~~ are their economic interests (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 21, pp 307-310). These two features--economic interests and affiliation with a class or a social group--are which determine, in the final account, the characteristics and behavior of large masses of people which make the social types of individuals. It is precisely in the relations which appear in this connection that the main reasons for the numerous and different ideological behavior motivations are rooted. Hence Marx's famous conclusion on the nature of man, a conclusion of radical importance in terms of historical materialism as a whole and the theory of the individual: "...The essence of man is not an abstract inherent in the individual. In reality, it is the totality of all social relations" (op. cit., vol 42, p 265). He also said that "...the true spiritual wealth of the individual depends entirely on the wealth of his actual relations..." (op. cit., vol 3, p 36).

Also related to this view on human nature are the ideas of the revolutionary reorganization of the world and exerting successful educational influence. "If the character of a person is the result of circumstances then perhaps circumstances should be made human" (op. cit., vol 2, pp 145-146). It is precisely in the process of remaking circumstances, i.e., in the practical revolutionary reorganization of reality, that the new personality is formed and more favorable conditions for its existence and development are created.

The practical reorganization of reality is carried out by the broad masses which, rising to the level of the active and conscious historical creativity, also shape a specific type of individual. This means that the fate of the individual and his freedom and development are considered by Marxism-Leninism in close connection with the fate of the masses and the classes, and their economic, sociopolitical and spiritual development. It is precisely thanks to this that Marx was able to replace the cult of the abstract person, which had dominated in all previous philosophy, with a science dealing with real people and their historical development (op. cit., vol 21, p 299).

We shall consider three aspects of Marx's theory of the individual, which offer clear and convincing proof of the lasting relevance of Marx's scientific, revolutionary and profoundly humanistic doctrine: the problems of the individual's alienation, freedom and all-round development.

1

Alienation should not be confused with so-called objectivizing. The conversion of labor into products or, in other words, the "objectivizing" of man's capabilities has existed and will remain as long as there is a production process. The alienation of labor is a historically transient phenomenon. It arises along with the added product which is appropriated by the exploiting classes: slaveowners, feudal lords and capitalists, i.e., together with the appearance of private property. Under the conditions of capitalist ownership the wealth created and accumulated through the labor of the workers becomes a tool of exploitation, the material force which applies against the workers all available means of economic coercion, political violence, spiritual oppression and deceit. It is natural for the "worker to consider the product of his toil as alien," "as an alien world, hostile and opposed to him" (op. cit., vol 42, pp 88, 91).

However, it is not a product of labor alone which becomes alienated. The production process itself is an active self-alienation factor. "...To the worker labor is something alien and not part of his nature; ...the worker does not assert himself through his labor but rejects himself, feeling not happy but unhappy. He does not freely develop his physical and spiritual energy but exhausts his physical nature and destroys his spiritual forces. That is the reason for which it is only outside work that the worker feels as himself whereas in the course of the labor process he feels alienated from himself. He is himself when he does not work; at work, he is no longer himself" (ibid., p 90). Therefore, the activities of the worker become the alienation of the worker from his own self. The worker behaves toward his own activities as toward something alien not belonging to him (ibid., p 91).

The alienation of the product and of labor itself predetermines the alienation among people. The fact that a person has become alienated from the product of his toil, his activities and his family and social nature and, consequently, from himself, is expressed in the reciprocal alienation among people. Under the conditions of a bourgeois society this is expressed by the fact that both labor and the product of the worker do not belong to him but to the capitalists (see *ibid.*, pp 95-97). For that reason relations of domination and subordination develop between them. Enmity and class struggle are the natural condition of such relations.

Such are, according to Marx, the basic characteristics which sum up the position of the proletariat and the alienation of the product of labor, labor itself and man under capitalism.

Naturally, a great deal has changed since Marx's time. However, the nature of exploitation has remained unchanged and so has alienation in bourgeois society. Furthermore, specialists have estimated that the percentage of the time which the American worker spends in working for the capitalist has increased from 40 to 66 percent (see "Karl Marks i Sovremennost'" [Karl Marx and Contemporaneity]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, p 133). In our time not only the physical but the mental abilities of the worker have become targets of exploitation. The most dangerous consequence of social alienation is the creation and stockpiling of thermonuclear weapons aimed at the mass destruction of people for the sake of the selfish interests of the capitalists.

Marx linked the elimination of alienation precisely with the elimination of the private ownership of productive capital, replacing it with public ownership achieved through revolution.

That which has already been achieved as a result of building a socialist society convincingly proves Marx's theoretical predictions. It is important to emphasize, however, that the conversion of productive capital from private to public ownership does not automatically result in the immediate transformation of all production, social and political relations, or changes in human awareness or the immediate development of a collectivist mentality in everyone. All of this takes place gradually, in the course of the complex and contradictory transformation of society, through struggle and searching. Nevertheless, strengthening socialist ownership and the power of the people, as indicated by the experience of the USSR and the other socialist countries, have been a firm foundation for the successful growth of the new economy and the development of a socialist way of life, culture and high consciousness.

It is equally impossible to refute the fact that thanks to the establishment of public property society has become an association of free toilers in which the entire public wealth--material and spiritual--is used in their interest and for the development of their capabilities. Naturally, social needs change and the conditions which prevail at the different stages in social development introduce various changes in the distribution of the national income in the interests of economic progress, strengthening defense, increasing culture and satisfying social needs and individual consumption requirement. However, such distribution is always objectively determined by the interests of the people,

the strengthening of their security and the preservation of peace. Naturally, any distribution could be better or worse. Errors and blunders, sometimes serious, could take place. It is important to emphasize that in such cases there is no confrontation between the interests of antagonistic classes in terms of distribution relations, in the course of which the exploiting class appropriates the work of the exploited. Problems and difficulties here shift to the level of a search for optimal methods for distributing and stimulating production, ensuring the best possible consideration of the quantity and quality of the work and the variety of interests of groups and individual members of society.

Furthermore, we must also take into consideration the fact that under socialist conditions the working person considers labor not only a means of existence and a source of personal well-being but an activity for the good of society, a service to the people. From a source of alienation of man work becomes a factor in asserting the dignity of the personality of the worker, a criterion of his social status and his reputation. The socialist working people are drawn into the administration of social affairs, which ensures their participation in state policy and educates them in a spirit of high civic responsibility. This takes man beyond the narrow range of personal concerns and into the vast world of socialist emotions and triggers in him new strength and talent. Involvement in a common project gives man powerful uplifting wings.

As a social phenomenon, therefore, alienation related to the appropriation of the products of the work of hired labor by the capitalists is abolished under socialism. Naturally, the consequences of centuries of dominant alienation remain in the sense that the individuals do not always accept public property as their collective possession or else try to make use of it illegally for the sake of personal enrichment. This is an evil which remains because of some still-existing reasons, such as shortcomings in education, control, etc.

However, some critics of Marxism and real socialism claim that since the state remains under socialism and since it is the state which distributes the national income, including a share allocated for social needs, it is the state which appropriates part of the workers' product which, they claim, also means alienation. In this case, however, the fact that part of the social product is used in the satisfaction of common needs (administration, education, defense, etc.) is interpreted as alienation. The purpose of such claims is to rub off the essential distinction which separates capitalism from socialism.

In order to hold proper positions in this case we must remember that alienation is a historical phenomenon related to the appearance of the private ownership of productive capital. We must also see the new feature which appears under socialism. The essential difference is that expenditures for common needs are made here in the interests of the entire people rather than the monopolies, the military-industrial complex in particular. In a socialist society there is no exploiting class which could monopolistically appropriate the results of joint labor. It is ruled by the principle "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work." Violations of this principle (theft, abuse, parasitism), which are committed by virtue of a number of reasons, are a social evil prosecuted in accordance with the laws.

There will always be common needs and if we consider expenditures for their satisfaction as alienation, we would go back to what we mentioned--an acknowledgment of the perpetuation of alienation. It is sometimes claimed that under socialism as well the worker does not always know where the product of his toil goes. The meaning of alienation, however, lies not only in such knowledge or ignorance. Under capitalism a worker may and frequently does know where his product goes and that it goes for the enrichment of the capitalist and the continuing exploitation of the worker.

We already said that Marx linked the state of the individual with that of the liberation of the masses. That is precisely why it is important to single out the changes which have taken place in personality features under socialism. As the individual bearer of social characteristics, the individual always represents the unity among the individual, the particular and the common. Naturally, the individual cannot be characterized without the identification of his individual characteristics. However, an individual without common characteristics, i.e., without belonging to a specific type, does not exist. Therefore, his personality cannot be understood without determining its common, its typical features. In other words, it is a question of two different concepts--the concept of the separate individual and that of the social type of individual. It is only the study of the common characteristics, of typical features and common characteristics in combining the common with the individual that takes us to the realm of objective laws, the identification of which has always been the essence and purpose of scientific knowledge.

If we wish to determine with scientific accuracy what has taken place with the individual under socialism we should begin first of all by describing the general changes which have taken place in the consciousness of the people and in their features and only on this basis judge the possibilities which are created for their individual development. Individual features are realized above all and mainly within the framework of individual freedom, through the comprehensive development of the capabilities and needs of the individual and, above all, in their active actions. In forecasting the development of the person under the conditions of the new society, Marx addressed himself more and precisely to the problems of the freedom and comprehensive development of human forces, considering the latter as the aim of a communist society (see op. cit., vol 25, part II, p 387).

In summing up all changes which have taken place in the objective situation of the working people under socialism, we could say that for the first time in history no class, national, religious or any other group features other than social characteristics common to all members of the society assume prime significance. This has been manifested in the development on a mass scale of their feeling of ownership, of a collectivistic and internationalist mentality and the aspiration to participate through their toil in strengthening the country and managing social affairs. The common features of a unified social type of individual, the new person, are manifested in the typological structure of society, in addition to specific and group human features. The socialist individual acts as an idea-minded individual who shares the objectives and principles of communist ideology and puts public interest first.

Difficulties in the education and reeducation of the people on a collectivistic basis were manifested more clearly in the course of the socialist changes. The private ownership and individualistic mentality of some people proved to be more durable than had been previously imagined. Clearly, its elimination will require more time and more effective measures. A contributing factor to this effect is that society was unable to allocate more funds for the development of education and upbringing, improvements in material well-being and cultural enhancement than allowed by international and domestic circumstances. Some errors in family and school upbringing and in the use of public sanctions and rewards also played a certain role. Finally, we must take into consideration the pressure exerted by the capitalist world which is trying to support antisocial elements through various means.

With a great deal of gloating, profiting from our difficulties, the anticommunists are trying to prove that the existence of some problems refutes the fact that a new type of person is being raised under socialism. It is quite indicative that they are considering precisely shortcomings, ignoring the infinitely more significant fact that the overwhelming majority of the population is being successfully raised in a socialist spirit.

2

Marxism-Leninism directly relates the liberation of the toiling individual to the elimination of capitalist exploitation and private ownership of productive capital. In answering the charge of their critics that the communists would like to eliminate all ownership as the base of individual freedom, Marx and Engels determined that such accusations concealed an attempt to present a fully determined freedom--the freedom of exploiting hired labor and the freedom of the development of a minority at the cost of suppressing the majority--as freedom of the individual in general. In their first programmatic document the communists stated that the freedom of the oppression of man by man must necessarily be eliminated. The old society with its classes and class antagonisms will be replaced by a society representing an association of working people "in which the free development of one is a prerequisite for the free development of all" (op. cit., vol 4, p 447).

In this connection, we must emphasize two facts. The first applies to Marx's and Engels's formula we cited. Sometimes it is interpreted in the sense that society cannot become free until the totally unlimited freedom of every individual has been secured. This view, however, leans toward anarchy. All societies have their bans and restrictions or, in other words, all societies determine their own limits of freedom. Any effort to come closer to the embodiment of the idea of freedom is doomed to failure if it calls for general arbitrariness, for this makes the idea itself questionable. The context of the "Communist Party Manifesto" shows that Marx and Engels referred not to all freedoms but to the freedom from exploitation, freedom from class oppression and class opposites. In this sense as well society cannot consider itself free unless it has substituted free cooperation among the members of society for capitalist exploitation.

The second fact is the following: Whereas the well-being and freedom of the personality of the capitalist are based on his possessions and if to him

freedom is equivalent to the freedom of owning this property, the freedom to exploit hired labor, to the proletariat the well-being and freedom of the individual consists of freedom from exploitation, the collective ownership of productive capital and the free creative self-assertion and development of one's forces and capabilities. Naturally, in the same way that the proletariat will reject the bourgeois formula, for to it it means "non-freedom," the bourgeoisie will reject the formula in the "Manifesto," for it means the elimination of the monopoly of bourgeois ownership and the rights, freedoms and opportunities related to it.

In speculating on the universal desire of preserving basic rights and freedoms, even under the conditions of a bourgeois society, the imperialist bourgeoisie, which fears the loss of its wealth and privileges, is trying to present the defense of its interest as a prerequisite for the freedom of all. This is the reason for the particular attention which the bourgeoisie pays to the problem of the "freedom" of the individual, the reason for prejudiced criticism of Marxist theory and practice and the reason for the sharp ideological-theoretical struggle waged between communist and bourgeois ideology.

However, the freedom of rescuing the working people from capitalist exploitation is only one, although most important aspect of freedom. It cannot be limited to a negative characteristic of freedom from something. Freedom acquires a meaning only when a person is "free" not as a result of the negative power of avoiding something or other but as a consequence of the positive power of showing his true individuality..." (op. cit., vol 2, p 145).

The commonality of the basic interests of social groups is established as a result of socialist changes. It is only when people are equal to one another and, above all, in terms of productive capital, when they are united by common ideas and plans, and when their relations are characterized by sociopolitical and ideological unity, it is only then that the class barriers which limit the freedom of the individual disappear; it is only then that favorable opportunities are created for the free expression of the aspirations of the individual and for the participation of everyone in the administration of public affairs. The alien forces which had dominated the people until that time fall under their control. As Engels wrote, "this means a leap for mankind from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom" (op. cit., vol 20, p 295).

Naturally, this type of freedom and organization does not suit the capitalists and it is natural for them to fight it and to fight for the freedom of the owner and the freedom of exploitation and the preservation of their economic and political domination. All of this, however, is allegedly done for the sake of the freedom of all members of society.

"Sovietologists" and anticommunists try to depict matters as though the rule of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the system of communist education lead to the loss of freedom of the individual and of the individual's unique features, converting him into a standardized automated unit of some kind of self-sufficing collective society. Such assessments notwithstanding, Soviet reality proves something else: the spiritual life in town and country, which

has been developing on a collectivistic basis for decades, is intensive, meaningful and varied. This is acknowledged by many foreign observers as well. Socialism offers broad and ever increasing opportunities for the manifestation of the creative activeness of the working people and the initiatives of millions of people and the development of their interests, capabilities and needs.

In recent years some critics of real socialism have begun to pit particularly persistently real socialism and social democracy against the concepts of ideological and political "pluralism."

This is worth looking into. "Pluralism," as it has developed in bourgeois society, is a complex and contradictory phenomenon. It may initially appear that it is a free play, a confrontation of political forces, in which those which prove to be more viable and active come out on top. However, is it possible to ignore the fact that the entire economic power, the punitive authorities, the armed forces and virtually all mass information and propaganda media are in capitalist hands? Obviously, this is impossible, although it is precisely this circumstance that the propagandists of bourgeois "pluralism" happen bashfully to circumvene.

Under the conditions of the growing political activeness of the working class and the working people and the real pressure applied by the masses on political parties, the monopoly bourgeoisie proclaims political "pluralism" to be an attribute of contemporary democracy, considering it under the present ratio of class forces an effective means of retaining the power by shifting it from time to time from one bourgeois party to another. Bourgeois propaganda presents ideological and political "pluralism" as a possibility of free manifestation of the universal will, for which reason it uses it to conceal the political domination of monopoly capital.

We know that certain rights and freedoms and the possibility of defending the interests of the working people, including through parliamentary means, have been gained by the working class and its political parties. The significance of these possibilities should be neither belittled nor exaggerated. They should not be belittled because the working class earned its rights in the course of a fierce political battle and because they facilitate its further struggle for its vital interests. They should not be exaggerated, for the bourgeoisie, relying on its economic and political power and ideological apparatus, defends its basic interests and is engaged in a permanent offensive against the interests and rights of the working class and the working people.

However, another experience is available today to history: the experience of a number of socialist countries which have allied political parties representing different toiling strata with the leading communist, Marxist-Leninist party; this experience has been practically tested for a number of decades. Here the variety of interests of the working people is truly represented by different political parties. Naturally, however, such "pluralism" is entirely different from what the "reformists" of real socialism dream about. What they need is something precisely in the spirit of bourgeois democracy.

The Soviet Union has acquired tremendous experience in a one-party rule system, in which the communist party acts as the leading force of the entire society. This experience proves that within the framework of such a political organization the entire variety of interests, viewpoints and opinions of the working people is widely represented and considered. The legislation guarantees freedom of conscience and religious belief. In other words, a socialist society includes an extensive variety of activities, interests and aspirations. Yet this again is not the type of "pluralism" for which our critics care. They need a political and ideological "pluralism" which would perpetuate the bourgeois order. Such "pluralism" in fact means suppressing the interests of the working people. "...Any freedom," Lenin said, "unless it is for the sake of the liberation of labor from the oppression of capital is a swindle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 349).

The socialist society is not guaranteed against the encroachments of individual people on the security of the members of society and the common interest as a whole and it cannot remain indifferent to such encroachments. In such cases the use of coercion is a necessary prerequisite for the freedom of society and a manifestation of concern for the freedom of its members. Naturally, society has a system of social prohibitions aimed at protecting the gains of socialism. Anti-Soviet subversive activities, treason, antisocialist propaganda, war propaganda, etc., are punished as severe crimes. In relying on its coercive and law and order apparatus, the socialist state ensured the protection of the rights and freedoms of the individual.

Naturally, we cannot claim that we have resolved all problems and have reached the highest possible level of democracy and freedom. Both are developing as material and spiritual possibilities increase and as the political institutions of society strengthen. Thus, the 1977 USSR Constitution is a qualitatively new step in improving the principles and norms relative to the status of the individual under socialism and his rights and freedoms. The constitution guarantees the right to choose a profession, to health care, housing, participation in governmental and social affairs, submission of suggestions to state organs and social organizations, criticism of work shortcomings and taking officials to court for their actions. Citizens' individual rights and freedoms have been broadened significantly. Respect for the individual and preservation of civic rights and freedoms are codified in the fundamental law as the obligation of all state organs and social organizations and officials. The norms of our morality and law do not allow any uncerecermonious invasion in personal relations of friendship and love; society promotes respect for private interests, tastes and opinions. As a rule, violations of such norms are condemned.

Freedom of the individual does not benefit the individual alone. Freedom is a necessary prerequisite for the further progress of socialist society and its growth into a communist society. The growth of output, the solution of social problems and the level of scientific and artistic creativity directly depend on the initiative, skills and ideological lines followed by officials on all levels of the social organism. No successful progress is possible without the creative discussion of theoretical and practical problems, criticism or self-criticism. The socialist society is concerned with the development of

comprehensive capabilities, inclinations and talents, for only thus could successful searches and effective solutions of ripe problems be ensured.

3

Marx's theory of the individual cannot be conceived without the theory of the comprehensive development of the liberated working person. The idea of the harmonious development of the individual runs through Marx's entire work, from the "Communist Party Manifesto" to "Das Kapital."

In Marxism the idea of the comprehensive development of human capabilities was combined, for the first time, with a real social need, not arbitrarily but on a strictly scientific basis. In considering the role of machines in large-scale industry, in the first volume of "Das Kapital" Marx reached the conclusion that the very development of industry "raises the following life or death problem: the monstrosity of the unfortunate reserve working population, which is kept in reserve to meet the changing needs of exploitative capitalism must be replaced with an absolute suitability of man to changing labor needs; the partial worker, the simple carrier of a certain partial social function must be replaced with a comprehensively developed individual to whom the various social functions will be alternating means of activity" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 499). In other words, as a result of the objective development of the production process the need arises of replacing the partial worker with a working person who can perform a variety of production activities. Whereas production functioning is merely a means of subsistence for the partial worker, in the case of the comprehensively developed individual participation in the production process is nothing but a means of activity, a manifestation, an embodiment of essential human forces, a realization as an individual. Such is the historical trend.

The implementation of this trend became possible only after the proletarian revolution was made and public ownership was established of productive capital, on the basis of a planned economy and universal education.

We see, therefore, that the Marxist-Leninist formulation of the problem means that it is a question of the development not only of individuals but of all working people. The all-round development of the individual becomes not simply and merely a humanistic idea but a real objective and a historically timely social requirement.

To what extent could the problem of the comprehensive development of the individual be considered a practical problem of our time? Opinions of this matter vary among theoretical workers. According to some, the formulation of the problem of the comprehensive development of the individual is premature, for a large number of workers engaged in hard, nonmechanized labor remains, as well as the existence of a number of other urgent problems which require a great deal of effort and time. Since the necessary conditions for resolving this problem do not exist, it is proclaimed a matter of the very distant future.

The other extreme is the assertion according to which our society has already created all the necessary conditions to resolve the problem of the comprehensive development of the individual.

Naturally, this is no simple question. Thoughts, studies and arguments are natural in this case. In our view, we cannot agree with the abstract categorical assertion that Soviet society has already created all the necessary conditions for the comprehensive development of the individual or the rejection of the possibility of undertaking the solution of this problem as of now, in practical terms. The point is that the development of contemporary production and the practical requirements of its mechanization and automation are precisely the factors which determine the required level of professional skill, activeness and responsibility of the worker and the need for a combination of skills. It is only a comprehensively developed highly cultured individual, who can combine the functions of the skilled worker and the social activist, who could meet all of these requirements. This is favored by the planned organization of the socialist economy and the fact that all training of worker cadres is provided by the government.

Meanwhile, life in the socialist society proves that the comprehensively developed individual has become reality in a certain sense in more than just isolated cases. Many of our contemporaries--workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals--who have acquired a good education and professional training and are comprehensively developed culturally present a new type of individual. They make extensive use of their knowledge and capabilities at work, engage in social projects and like literature and art. Need we mention that such people are infinitely varied and original, with their strong and weak sides and attachments and inclinations.

We have adequate grounds for further progress along the way of the comprehensive development of man. It consists of the technical production standard, the skills of the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry and a powerful scientific potential. Under present-day conditions active human efforts are manifested precisely in the acquisition of high and varied skills, ideological maturity and moral and political responsibility, which is precisely what enables the individual to apply his intellectual and moral capabilities and to assert his dignity, his "self" so to speak, in the course of his work and social activities.

Shaping the activeness and responsibility of the members of society is not simply an important task. It is the most important, the main problem of the party and the state, for its resolution provides a key to the implementation of all other tasks--production, economic, social and educational--and is the pivot of the party's entire policy. "While changing the conditions of human life," said Comrade K. U. Chernenko at his meeting with the voters of Kuybyshevskiy Rayon in Moscow, "we must also do everything possible for their ideological and moral enhancement. It is clear that without extensive work for the spiritual development of individuals and their socialist upbringing we would be unable to cope with the task of perfecting mature socialism."

Enhancing the well-being of the Soviet people, economic intensification, updating of economic sectors and perfecting their management, rationalizing the

economic mechanism, strengthening cost-accounting principles and improving the activities of soviets and party organizations as well as the solution of many other equally important and significant problems depend on the level of development of the initiative and creativity of the toiling masses, for, as K. U. Chernenko emphasized, "the importance of what we describe as the human factor in economic progress has not diminished. Put otherwise, this applies to the knowledge, interests and feelings of the people." It is precisely from this viewpoint that the party considers problems of distribution and rewards, strengthening discipline and law and order, implementing the school reform, mastering the Leninist workstyle in its entire variety, increasing publicity in the activities of management authorities and developing criticism and self-criticism.

The nature of socialism as a social system is such that it can successfully function and develop only with the high activeness of the masses. Whatever problem we may consider--whether economic or legal--its socialist decision requires the conscious participation of the masses themselves, for it affects their interests and depends on their unanimity, competence and diligence. The problem of the activity of the masses under socialism is the most important in resolving all practical problems of the new society. Lenin emphasized that socialism "is not created by ukase from above" and that it "is the creation of the people's masses themselves" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 35, p 57). It is only the experience of millions of people which can provide the necessary instructions in building the new life. That is why from the very first steps of the new social system, the leader of the revolution sought specific means of upgrading such activeness, considering it the most important prerequisite for the functioning and development of socialist society.

Therefore, we can claim with full justification that Karl Marx's scientific prediction, based on the study of real trends in capitalism, including the development of the individual, is extensively confirmed. Naturally, life always turns out to be more complex, varied and contradictory than it appears in theoretical works. However, the established real socialist society convincingly proves that Marx, Engels and Lenin were correct in their basic and essential stipulations. Today's socialist experience itself enables us to conclude that socialism, followed by communism, is the necessary social system which can and must adopt and further develop the achievements of the material and spiritual culture of mankind under conditions in which, consequently, society will continue to develop in the future.

The acquired experience proves that the use of the advantages of socialism largely depends on the activeness of the subjective factor, the high standards of the members of the socialist society and their general educational and professional training. The efforts of our party and Soviet state are precisely directed today on the development of all such qualities of the individual and the creation of favorable conditions for a further advancement.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/1

IDEOLOGY OF A RISING CLASS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 45-57

[Text] On the occasion of next year's 115th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birthday, Politizdat is preparing the publication of the large collective work "Lenin, Filosofiya, Sovremennost'" [Lenin, Philosophy, Contemporaneity]. We submit to the readers the book's conclusion authored by R. I. Kosolapov and Academician T. I. Oyzerman.

The historical destinies of all non-Marxist sociopolitical doctrines (both those which appeared before and after the birth of Marxism) share a common feature: however significant their influence may have been at one point, it is in inverse ratio to social development. In other words, such influence steadily declines, since new historical experience, while confirming the small contribution to the positive development of science, also refutes their basic concepts.

The reasons for this are well-known. As a whole, pre-Marxist sociopolitical doctrines, including even the most outstanding among them, lacked as a whole a scientific nature (in the strict meaning of the term). As to theories which were formulated after the appearance of Marxism and in opposition to it, they had far less to do with true science compared to those which preceded Marxism, for the spiritual crisis in capitalist society and the moral groundlessness of the bourgeoisie in facing the future began when the proletariat turned from "a class within itself" into a "class for itself," and from the appearance of scientific socialism and its unification with the labor movement. The founders of Marxism noted the appearance of this crisis as early as the 1870s, i.e., at the beginning of the transition from premonopoly capitalism to imperialism.

Marxism is the first and only social theory whose influence grows with each new historical epoch. In his article "The Historical Fate of Karl Marx's Theory," which came out in 1913, V. I. Lenin noted three main periods which preceded the development of Marxism: (1) from the 1848 revolution to the Paris Commune (1871); (2) from the Paris Commune to the first Russian revolution (1905); (3) from the 1905 revolution on. During the first period, Marx's theory was "only one of the exceptionally numerous factions or trends in

socialism" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 1). During the second period Marxism won a theoretical and ideological victory over the petit bourgeois trends which dominated the labor movement. The influence of Marxism was particularly intensified during the third period which immediately preceded the Great October Socialist Revolution. "After the appearance of Marxism each of these three great epochs in universal history brought to it further confirmation and new triumphs," Lenin wrote in conclusion. "However, as the doctrine of the proletariat, Marxism will bring about even greater triumphs in the future" (ibid., p 4).

In a certain sense, the future mentioned by Lenin has already become the present. Socialism, which initially won in a single country, is today a global social system. This precisely is that "even greater triumph" which Lenin anticipated in 1913. Unquestionably, subsequent social progress will take place generally and as a whole within the channel of Marxist-Leninist plans, through a conversion to socialist organization of production and social life in the capitalist part of the world, despite a variety of forms and different time periods yet, as a whole, coinciding in terms of content, by upgrading the maturity of the new system and building a classless communist society in the socialist countries.

A scientific nature and a close unity with the requirements of social development and the interests of the working class and all working people and, in the final account, all progressive mankind is the essential source of the inexhaustible vital strength of Marxism and its lasting contemporaneity. However, comical though this might appear, the bourgeois opponents of Marxism are tirelessly blabbering about its alleged obsolescence. In fact, it is this chatter itself that has become hopelessly obsolete. Marxism does not age, for it develops steadily. The natural and powerful extension of Marxism into Leninism, the unprecedented influence of Marxism-Leninism on all 20th-century sociopolitical practices and its steady enrichment with summations and lessons of such practices are an impressive confirmation of the creative nature of the revolutionary doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, regardless of the narrow-minded and self-seeking theoreticians of the contemporary bourgeoisie who try to refute this fact.

Such theoreticians usually claim that the capitalism of today is radically different from the capitalism of the last century, which was studied by K. Marx. The Marxists are accused of ignoring qualitative differences in the development of the capitalist production method and bourgeois society, persistently defending the theoretical concepts which allegedly reflected their previous development. However, none other than Lenin systematically studied in his theory of imperialism the qualitative distinction between this highest and final stage of the capitalist system and premonopoly capitalism which preceded it. Some features of this capitalism, Lenin pointed out, convert into their opposites. Thus, the rule of free competition grows into the domination of gigantic monopolies. This, however, does not eliminate in the least the basic foundations of the capitalist economic system. Capital concentration and centralization, which was studied most thoroughly by Marx, become incredibly intensified. The accelerated pace of the technological and organizational socialization of labor and production (naturally, on the basis of private ownership) intensifies the antagonistic contradictions inherent in

a capitalist economy and make increasingly necessary and inevitable the transfer of productive capital to the entire society. In analyzing this law, on the eve of the October Revolution Lenin wrote that "...socialism is nothing other than the next step forward from state-capitalist monopoly. In other words, socialism is nothing but state-capitalist monopoly converted to the benefit of the entire people and, therefore, no longer existing as a capitalist monopoly" (op. cit., vol 34, p 192). This means that the development of state-monopoly capitalism is steadily advancing in the main direction of the universal-historical process which was scientifically established by Marxism-Leninism.

Naturally, historical necessity has not come about by itself, automatically. The imperialistic bourgeoisie desperately opposes social progress, which its supporters describe as a merciless and pitiless monster. The ruling, commanding, and exploiting minority has extensive resources at its disposal in this connection. It runs the bureaucratic, military-police state apparatus, the apparatus of monopoly associations and the mass information (and disinformation) media, i.e., all the necessary tools of power which it comprehensively strengthens in order maximally to hinder and delay inevitable social change. Militant militarism, a feverish armament race, an atmosphere of fear, suspicion and insecurity, steadily intensified by the imperialist governments, anticommunist hysteria and demagoguery and frightening the people with the imaginary "Soviet military threat," combined with the preaching of unrestrained chauvinism, are all, in the final account, nothing other than the answer which imperialist reaction offers to the historically obvious socialist alternative.

It is precisely this obviousness, which Lenin's genius perspicaciously brought to light on the eve of the October Revolution, that forces the most farsighted ideologues of the contemporary bourgeoisie to claim that today the capitalist society is actually also following a path of radical change and implementing the ideals of equality and justice. Lenin predicted this ideological disguise even while its theoreticians were unanimously asserting the eternal nature of capitalism and the impossibility of the existence of any other social system in a civilized society. In exposing the social demagoguery concealed behind "socialist" phraseology, Lenin wrote: "'socialism' in general, as an objective, as the opposite of capitalism (or imperialism) is acknowledged today...by many bourgeois social politicians as well" (op. cit., vol 30, p 214). The falseness and hypocrisy of bourgeois ideology, clearly demonstrated in such statements, are based less on the personal or psychological characteristics of some ideological defenders of the capitalist class than by the general crisis of the capitalist system itself. The entire matter in this case (as is frequently acknowledged even by philosophers quite unrelated to Marxism) is that the contemporary bourgeoisie, as represented by its ideologues, is unable to pit against socialism any kind of long-term positive social program. It is easy, therefore, to understand the persistent demand voiced at the beginning of the 1960s by the noted French anticommunist R. Aron of "avoiding the pitting of capitalism against socialism and considering capitalism and socialism as two varieties of the same entity--the industrial society..." (R. Aron, "Dix huit lecons sur la societe industrielle" [18 Lectures on Industrial Society]. Paris, 1962, p 50). Naturally, in fact Aron steadily pitted bourgeois society against socialist society and his efforts

were aimed at instilling new illusions in those who had lost faith in bourgeois "values," to the effect that, having changed, capitalism was now implementing the humanistic ideals formulated and scientifically substantiated by Marxism. Such a "liberal" approach, which has become less fashionable in the West today, is hardly different in essence from the frenzied attacks on the socialist social system and the intention of dumping it "on the ash-heap of history," voiced by today's inspirers of the anticommunist "crusade."

Lenin's stipulation to the effect that no intermediary social system is possible between contemporary capitalism and socialism and that state-monopoly capitalism is the most complete material preparation for socialism proves, on the one hand, the most profound knowledge of the essence of economic and social processes occurring in bourgeois society and, on the other, constitutes a brilliant anticipation of the future which, ever since the victory of the socialist revolution in our country, has been mercilessly confirmed by contemporary reality. "Vladimir Il'ich had the rare gift of seeing in the present the future destinies of mankind," K. U. Chernenko emphasizes. "Always as one with life, practice and the real conditions and possibilities of a given historical period, the thoughts of the great leader were thrust far into the future. Lenin illuminated with his scientific predictions the path which the working class was to cover for many decades in the future." No single exploiting class had or could have an ideological weapon of such striking power. It is not astounding that our class enemy, the monopoly bourgeoisie above all, considers Leninism and the theory and practice of scientific socialism a threat to its power, its profits and its very existence. It is precisely this which defines the unrestrained aspiration of bourgeois ideologues of all hues to discredit Leninism at all cost, as the contemporary extension and working condition of Marxism, an aspiration which must be countered by every communist, every conscientious worker and every progressively thinking person, with all his strength.

Let us cite another example which clearly confirms the outstanding feature in the development of Marxism-Leninism, noted by K. U. Chernenko. In developing the theory of the socialist revolution, Lenin scientifically summed up the historical experience of class battles under imperialist conditions. The struggle waged by the proletariat against capitalists and exploitation relations remains the main motive force of the global revolutionary process. However, the social base of this process becomes tremendously broader: the former colonial peoples, struggling for their true national liberation, whose access to the field of historical action was previously prevented, are joining the anti-imperialist movement. The alliance between the liberation struggle waged by the proletariat and the liberation movements of peoples enslaved by imperialism and the leading role of the working class in the struggle waged by all the oppressed and exploited intensify the rising of the revolutionary wave to an unparalleled extent.

Long before the present, Lenin pointed out that "in the future decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the earth's population, initially directed toward national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism...." (op. cit., vol 44, p 38). The entire post-October age has confirmed this great prediction. Although today colonial empires no longer exist and the former colonial peoples have established their

national statehood, they are still forced to defend their economic and political independence in the struggle against imperialist expansion and neocolonialism.

In their efforts to "refute" Leninism, contemporary bourgeois authors occasionally resort to the following method: although forced to acknowledge its great sociopolitical influence, they try to minimize the influence of its theoretical legacy. Thus, they claim that Lenin's philosophical ideas, his criticism of Machism and "physical" idealism are inapplicable today, for the theories of Mach and Avenarius, as well as idealism in general, have long become nothing but dust-covered files in the archives. Such a puzzling statement becomes understandable if we consider the persistent aspiration of today's idealists to interpret their rejection of the classical forms of idealism as representing its total and definitive elimination.

Naturally, idealism does not remain static. It renovates its form, changes its arguments and revises individual concepts. However, such metamorphoses of idealistic philosophy have nothing in common with the actual rejection of idealism. Lenin analyzed most thoroughly this rather aged trend toward again and again depicting new variations on the old idealistic theme as the elimination of idealism. "In our time a philosopher must not proclaim himself a 'realist' or 'enemy of idealism'" (op. cit., vol 18, p 344). This concept, which was expressed 75 years ago, is still relevant.

Idealism is experiencing a deep crisis. In their efforts to find a solution, the idealists no longer insist as frequently as in the past on the existence of some kind of supernatural metaphysical prime cause. Leaving this question aside and turning to experience and subjectivistically interpreting the relative nature of our knowledge, contemporary idealism "limits itself" to rejecting objective truth, presenting this position as the viewpoint of 20th century natural science and as the basis for the latest outstanding discoveries. Whereas previously idealism parasitized on the "blank spots" in the area of natural science research and the inevitable incompleteness of scientific data, today it is trying to rely on the achievements of physics and other natural sciences, depicting such accomplishments as the "collapse" of materialism. Essentially concentrating on gnosiological problems, 20-century idealism tries above all to refute the concept of objective truth, claiming that it is alien to contemporary natural science and that it defends nothing but an allegedly obsolete materialistic philosophy. "Contemporary fideism," Lenin ironically points out, "does not refute science in the least; all it refutes is the 'excessive claims' of science, namely that of objective truth" (op. cit., vol 18, p 127). In developing the Marxist understanding of materialism, Lenin says: "To consider our perception of the images of the external world--to acknowledge objective truths--and to support the viewpoint of the materialistic theory of knowledge are one and the same" (ibid., p 134). In emphasizing that objective truth is discovered already on the level of the sensory reflection of the outside world, Lenin thus refutes the arguments of the opponents of sensualism, particularly the objective idealists (Plato, Hegel, etc.), who acknowledged the exclusive existence of a supersensory transcendental truth. It is self-evident that objective truth, as Lenin proves in "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," is not manifested in the sensory reflection of the external world only. Scientific concepts relative to atoms,

electrons, etc., are objective truths although inaccessible to any sensory perception.

No particular insight is needed to realize that Lenin's views on objective truth are especially applicable today. Let us consider the facts. As we know, neopositivism reduced all philosophical problems to problems of gnosiology which, furthermore, were subjected to rather harsh restrictions. In emphasizing the difference between their philosophy and Machism and empiriocriticism, i.e., the older forms of positivistic philosophy, the neopositivists nevertheless fully shared and even intensified the Machist rejection of objective truth. The inevitability of reaching such a negativistic position was theoretically predetermined by the neopositivistic formulation of the question of an objective reality independent of human awareness. Both its acknowledgment and rejection are proclaimed groundless and deprived of scientific meaning. Consequently, neopositivism rejected the possibility of comparing human concepts with objects existing regardless of the mind. Mankind knows nothing of such objects and even concerning their very existence, the positivists claimed. It is entirely clear that Lenin's criticism is also fully applicable to that trend, for it is directed above all against the common feature linking the varieties of positivistic philosophy. Neopositivistic philosophy appeared in the historical arena after Lenin. This circumstance shows even more clearly the significance of Lenin's criticism of Machism which, as we can see, exposes any kind of positivism.

Today neopositivism has become almost comprehensively supplanted by "post-positivism," within which the "critical rationalism," initiated by K. Popper, proved to be the most influential. Popper considers himself a supporter of "realism," an opponent of idealism, etc. Although opposing a number of fundamental neopositivistic concepts, Popper fully agrees with the neopositivistic interpretation of objective truth. Furthermore, a negativistic concept of truth is the nucleus of his philosophy.

In his main work "The Logic of Research," Popper claimed that the concept of truth should be excluded from the theory of knowledge. It is true that subsequently he was forced to reduce such a harsh sentence and to include the problem of truth in his gnosiological theory. However, this did not change but merely modified his subjectivistic concept. Science, according to Popper, "could never claim to achieve truth or anything in its stead, such as probability, for example" (K. Popper, "Logika i Rost Nauchnogo Znaniya" [Logic and the Growth of Scientific Knowledge]. Moscow, 1983, p 226). Popper, who considers his task in his struggle against the "ideal of reliability" as proving the thesis that scientific concepts are scientific only to the extent to which they are essentially refutable, proclaims any conviction in the truth of one scientific theory or another no more than irrational faith. He writes that "we can never rationally justify a theory, i.e., our faith in the accuracy of a theory or in the fact that it is probably true" (ibid. p 230).

Inasmuch as they are experimental, according to Popper scientific concepts can be neither proven nor empirically substantiated. They are accepted only as long as they have not been refuted.

Therefore, Popper's "critical rationalism," which operates under the banner of the latest "philosophy of science," has left far behind the Machist and neopositivistic rejection of objective truth. Machists and neopositivists still acknowledged the existence of some truth, even though not an objective one. Popper is far more radical, for which reason, unlike his predecessors, he does not suppress fideistic conclusions. He loudly proclaims that it is thanks to his philosophy, which has reduced truth to faith, that the conflict between science and...religion is entirely resolved. This conflict is characterized by the philosopher, who describes his doctrine as rationalistic and, furthermore (unlike classical rationalism) critical, as a sad misunderstanding, one of the reasons for which, apparently, has been the absence of his gnosiological theory so far. Henceforth, Popper proclaims, "the 19th century conflict between science and religion has been eliminated, in my view. Since noncritical rationalism is groundless, the solution of the problem does not lie in the choice between knowledge and faith but only between two kinds of faith" (K. Popper, "The Open Society and Its Enemies." Volume 2, London, 1946, p 246).

We have mentioned merely a few (although quite typical, influential and fashionable) trends in contemporary idealistic philosophy. However, even they are more than sufficient to see the tremendous or even the ever-growing role of Lenin's philosophical ideas. Lenin's criticism of Machism, pragmatism and other idealistic doctrines has always exceeded the limits of their specific and, as a rule, rather narrow subject, developing into a criticism of idealism in general. In singling out and emphasizing what distinguishes one idealistic theory from another, Lenin always gave priority to the features inherent in all such doctrines and to the basic content of idealism which is essentially independent of its individual varieties. The systematic pitting of materialism against idealism in all areas and the profound analysis of the social underlining of philosophical trends and their ideological direction are the line followed by the party in science, giving Lenin's contribution to Marxist philosophy its exceptional vitality.

At the dawn of Marxism the genius whose name it bears formulated in his "Thesis on Feuerbach" an entire program for the all-round development of the outlook and ideology of the revolutionary proletariat. We now have the possibility of comparing this program with the previous decades and with previous accomplishments. Having no intention in this necessarily short conclusion to cover in somewhat greater detail this problem, which demands a special thorough consideration, let us draw attention merely to a single yet essential aspect of the matter.

In his very first thesis Marx critically assessed the entire previous contemplative materialism in which object, reality and sensuality were considered "only in the form of an object or a contemplation, rather than as sensory-human activities and practices; they were not considered subjectively" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 42, p 261). Pre-Marxian materialism considered knowledge mainly the result of the influence of the outside world on the sensory organs of man, ignoring or underestimating the circumstance that knowledge is based on the influence which the people exert on this world and the changes in the outside world made by people. This inability to include real human action into the process of knowledge and to

study its gnosiological significance led to the fact that a gap invariably developed in the theory of knowledge of pre-Marxian materialists between the object and the subject and between nature and social environment, on the one hand, and mankind, with its various communities, on the other. It was a gap which nothing could apparently fill or surmount. Idealism frequently parasitized on this weakness of pre-Marxian materialism, claiming that the only solution to this "dualism" of subject and object is the acknowledgment of the spiritual nature of the object of our study. The various systems of a many-faced agnosticism proclaimed the essential impossibility of leaving the "room" of our awareness and going into the objects which surrounded us. The result was that "the active feature, in opposition to materialism, developed an abstract idealism which, naturally, could not acknowledge a real, a sensory activity as such" (ibid.) Naturally, idealism interpreted practical experience as a purely spiritual process, reaching, in the final account, the conclusion that human awareness (spirit) is familiar only with the spirit of what has been created and, essentially, with spiritual reality. Dialectical materialism totally eliminated the fatal one-sidedness of metaphysical materialism with its interpretation of knowledge as a passive attitude toward the world and the harm caused by incorporeal idealistic activeness. It brought to light and identified the binding link, the powerful intermediary link between consciousness and matter in social practice, turning it into the main category of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

The following dilettante question is still being asked even among professional philosophers: What came first--dialectical materialism or historical materialism? Is this not the same as asking with infantile persistence what came earlier, the chicken or the egg? This means that the questioners metaphysically separate "dialectical materialism" from "historical materialism," which are successfully used in teaching Marxist-Leninist philosophy and in tracing lines of demarcation among the various philosophical problems involved in research activities; they divide them into two separate scientific disciplines. If we apply these concepts, based on the fact that dialectical materialism is also Marxist philosophy (see V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 18, p 5), we will inevitably be forced to answer the following "question" as well: Is historical materialism a philosophical science? Therefore, a minor inaccuracy on one point leads to the subsequent appearance of a number of pseudoproblems.

Dialectical materialism appeared as historical materialism or, in other words, as the dialectical-materialistic concept of society and its history. This view is substantiated by facts and facts only.

To begin with, Marx and Engels began at the point where their materialistic predecessors had stopped--a "further building" of materialism "to the top," and the elaboration of a materialistic concept of the natural historical process. This is most easily confirmed by reading all the works of Marx and Engels written between 1840 and 1860, where the new philosophical trend they submitted was based and developed almost exclusively on data borrowed from political economy, sociology, history and the contemporary political struggle. Hence the far from random description of dialectical materialism which we find in Lenin's first works: "The dialectical method--unlike the metaphysical one--was described by Marx and Engels as precisely a scientific method in

sociology, in the sense that society is considered a living organism in a state of continuing development (rather than something mechanistically coupled and, therefore, allowing all kinds of arbitrary combinations of individual social elements), the study of which requires the objective analysis of production relations which form a specific social system and the study of the laws governing its functioning and development" (op. cit., vol 1, p 165). Consequently, Lenin had in mind that Marxist dialectics was developed above all (and mainly) on the basis of materials from the social sciences and historical experience. The dialectical-materialistic processing of natural science data was to come far later and corresponding works appeared in the 1870s, after "Das Kapital" had been essentially completed and the Marxist world outlook had become fully crystallized.

Secondly, Engels has occasionally used synonymously the terms "dialectical materialism" and "historical materialism," investing the term "historical" with an entirely clear meaning. He had in mind the materialism which is used in the study of any object--natural, social or spiritual--in its establishment and development. He could not conceive of studying an object without tracing its origins and showed a lively interest in its history. This helps us to understand the familiar concept of the founders of Marxism to the effect that "we recognize a single science only, the science of history. History can be considered from two sides. It could be divided into the history of nature and the history of people" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 3, p 16). Naturally, it was not a question of limiting a scientific study within its sociological framework or rejecting any reality other than social life and social consciousness, but of ascribing a universal significance to the historical-genetic principle, i.e., of applying it to anything extant and considering the latter in all stages of its appearance, establishment, blossoming, maturity, descent, decline and, finally, death or, which is one and the same, a conversion into something else, i.e., dialectically, in the full meaning of the term.

Thirdly, what is historical materialism (in the present meaning of the term) or a materialistic understanding of history if not a developed comprehensively active side of the blend of materialism and dialectics and the expanded Marxist theory of practice as an unfading and all-embracing process of interaction between the active subject, human society, which lives and develops through public production, and its opposite object, which includes all objects of nature within the realm of social interests and influences and the entire habitat, including the development of near space? The erroneousness of exaggerating the difference between dialectical and historical materialism, converting an extremely necessary group of problems (philosophical problems of the natural sciences, logic and gnosiology--"diamat," and the most general laws of social development and the determining role which material production plays in them, the dialectics of production forces and production relations, the correlation and interaction between base and superstructure, the role of the people's masses and individuals in history, and so on and so forth--"histmat") into a questionable contraposition is confirmed by Marx's formulation in his second "Thesis on Feuerbach" of the question of "Does human thinking have an object truth..." (op. cit., vol 42, p 261).

We have already seen the way positivists, neopositivists and post-positivists would answer the question. The fear has been expressed that even authors who have tried to "energize" the category of dialectical materialism with the help of formalized mathematical logic, or else to dilute it in "general scientific" terminology could hardly say anything substantial. Let us now hear Marx. This, he writes, is "not in the least a question of theory but of practice. The truthfulness, i.e., the actuality and power and comprehensiveness of one's thinking must be proved through practice. The argument of the reality or unreality of thinking isolated from practice," Marx deems necessary to add, "is a purely scholastic question" (ibid.). This means that the question of truth, which has always been classified as part of the theory of knowledge could be interpreted in an entirely Marxist way and resolved only within the context of sociological practice. "Truth is a process," Lenin asserts. "Man proceeds from a subjective idea to objective truth through 'practice' (and technology)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 29, p 183). The practice of knowledge and its "product"--truth--, passed through the "crucible" of practical knowledge, cannot fail to acquire a social nature and are considered by Marxism-Leninism as social categories. Let us go even further: in the precisely identical way that the materialistic understanding of history (historical materialism) must be dialectical-materialistic, dialectical materialism can only be historical-materialistic. Any other approach leads to meaningless dialectics, which does not combine opposites and lead to their unity" (ibid., p 253), as Hegel himself proved, something which inevitably leads to eclecticism and scholasticism.

Let us note in this connection another organically inherent feature of Marxism-Leninism such as its rejection of any type of confrontation between philosophical and gnosiological knowledge. Lenin described the materialistic understanding of history as "synonymous with social science" (op. cit., vol 1, p 140). Unlike the old materialism, he pointed out, "throughout his life, along with his theoretical works, Marx paid unabated attention to problems of the tactics of the proletarian class struggle" (op. cit., vol 26, p 77). He emphasized that "...materialism deprived of this aspect was justifiably considered by Marx as being halfway, one-sided and ghastly" (ibid.).

No one has ever developed or concretized the effective, the critical-revolutionary and creatively transforming aspect of Marxism and its true nature as Lenin. "Even the smallest particle of dust should carry bolshevik enthusiasm," Vladimir Mayakovskiy wrote in speaking of Lenin's style. The ability to assess petty aspects of daily work and life, considering them a reflection and a cell of the universal-historical process, on the one hand, and the art of relating even the most seemingly abstract "matters," such as Hegel's dialectical legacy or the revolution in the natural sciences to the daily needs of the class struggle of the proletariat, on the other, are the features of the fact that all of Leninism, from its powerful heart to its tiniest capillary, is imbued with the idea of the urgency, inevitability and ripening of the socialist revolution. Regardless of the topic discussed in Lenin's works, even if some of it may not be consistent with corresponding direct formulas, it is essentially aimed at linking current events and scientific considerations with the final objective of the revolutionary worker movement and to orient the reader more clearly in the political situation and lead him along the right way.

We know that bolshevism grew and strengthened in the course of an irreconcilable principled struggle against the opportunism of the leaders of the Second International. Could it be possible that there were no Marxists among such leaders or, at least experts familiar with the works of Marx and Engels? Such people existed and some of them, particularly those who had the opportunity to communicate personally with the founders of Marxism--were well-known personalities. For example, K. Kautsky was highly quoted among the social democrats of the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries as a "teacher" of Marxism (as he was respectfully referred to by many). Lenin himself highly valued his knowledge. However, he also clearly saw that in Kautsky's knowledge was more of an antiquarian-collector's and dogmatic rather than practical, revolutionary-practical nature. As we know, this turned into a great affliction for the German organized labor movement. Following the outbreak of World War I, the German (actually, not the German alone) social democrats supported their own warring imperialist government and essentially betrayed the socialist cause, and when the October Revolution was made, Kautsky, who considered it "premature" and "illegal," called for the overthrow of the Soviet system for the sake of "democracy" and preserving the dictatorship which the victorious Russian proletariat had assumed.

Lenin and the bolsheviks prevented the reduction of Marxism to a state of contemplative materialism. They did not allow its debasement by adapting it to the limited needs and interests of the prosperous and educated philistine who had found his suitable place in bourgeois society and who feared like fire the activeness of the masses and revered as the supreme wisdom the observance of bourgeois legality. Lenin and the Leninists alone, having applied Marxism extensively and on a mass scale, were able to prove the inexhaustible energy potential of our revolutionary doctrine. Reality revealed a number of examples of well-thinking "revolutionaries," who spent decades in intensive thinking without being able to answer the question of whether or not to engage in revolutionary work in the absence of a revolutionary situation. A tradition even developed of justifying one's own revolutionary inaction with the help of so-called evolutionary untimeliness. Unfortunately, no psychological portrait of such an "activist" has as yet been drawn. It would be particularly interesting to describe the moment when he has finally reached a revolutionary situation but, not knowing what to do, for understandable reasons, fearing that something may be done incorrectly and, sometimes, out of simple cowardice, does not admit to himself that such a situation has already come and wastes his entire energy in convincing others of the absence of the same. Those who think and act in a Leninist manner are spared such "languor of the spirit." They participate in the implementation of one reform or another when no upsurge in the revolutionary movement is noted, considering this as part of revolutionary work and linking minor results accomplished through a series of occasionally quite lengthy intermediary ties to the end objective of the class struggle of the proletariat. It is for the sake of this final objective that they master all the forms of struggle without forgetting, for example, in the course of daily trade union work, the need to be able firmly to rebuff the armed counterrevolution at the proper time or losing in the course of endless twisted parliamentary debates, which require quite specific training and skills, the ability to turn to the masses with the straight and honest truth which can reach everyone.

Naturally, this is not to say that the moment when a revolutionary situation appears is no longer important. Absolutely not. The precise determination of this moment and the ability promptly to mobilize oneself and impeccably to define the direction of the main strike, efficiently deploying one's forces, skillfully maneuvering and steadily increasing one's success are exceptionally important when society as a whole has become ripe for replacing one social system with another. However, this requires preparations--ideological, moral, organizational, financial, technical and many others--for which one must be ready. This requirement must be met above all by the political vanguard and the most progressive strata of the revolutionary class, whose awareness of their own role must be harmoniously consistent with their ability and resolve to perform it.

Leninism is the direct continuation and creative development of Marxism under the conditions of the growth of capitalism into its obvious and final stage. It is the strategy and tactics of the victorious proletarian revolution and of the general anti-imperialist, social and national liberation struggle, which has acquired decades of experience in the successful implementation of scientific socialism, by dozens of nations as well as a theoretical summation. Why is it that to this day it is still attacked or else that efforts are made to ignore it? We are not referring to the open anticommunists. Let us also ignore the undereducated, those who have been misled by bourgeois propaganda or have lacked the opportunity to learn. But what are the reasons for which Leninism proves to be "inconvenient" to some people abroad who call themselves Leninists? Without attempting to provide an exhaustive answer to this question let us merely note the following feature: the active aspect of Marxism has been developed within Leninism so profoundly and comprehensively and the total merger of revolutionary theory with revolutionary practice has been achieved to such an extent that any comparison between this giant of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action and the specific activities of one progressive party, group or individual or another always confirms the fact that a great deal of work lies ahead of them.... Through its entire meaning Leninism awakens the conscience of the honest revolutionary. Leninism itself is that conscience. However, if we are dealing with people who share petty bourgeois vestiges and individualistic prejudices, if we come across those who thirst not for a revolution but only for careers at its expense and, if, finally, we come across individuals who value not the revolution within themselves but themselves within the revolution, as the saying goes, in all such cases Leninism triggers merely irritation and alarm; it calls for structuring one's life and behavior in a manner entirely different from that of another individual. Restrained or drastic, or individual or collective, such a reaction does not change the essence of the matter. In all such cases Leninism fulfills its great revolutionizing mission. It expels the second-rate philistines from the field of politics and inspires the dedicated fighters. Our entire practical experience abounds in examples proving that it is precisely "people with complexes" that are the most arrogant and aggressive. It is precisely this type of person who accounts for a significant percentage of "critics" of Leninism, for without the serious mastery of Leninism one cannot seriously understand the subjective factor of the revolution. This particularly applies to periods when the objective prerequisites for a revolution have become essentially present.

As a rule the contemporary bourgeois theoreticians ignore Lenin's role in the development of philosophy and Marxism as a whole. This ideological stand is easily explainable: the opponents of Marxism-Leninism are unable to pit against this doctrine concepts which were not refuted by Marx, Engels and Lenin a long time ago, or which could be refuted by their students and followers with no particular difficulty. In other words, most of the latest arguments opposing Marxism-Leninism are drawn by its enemies from the very distant past and given merely a different semantic interpretation. For example, when today's anticommunists claim that the elimination of private ownership is the equivalent to the destruction of the human personality, as one can easily see, they are merely repeating verbatim arguments almost 150 years old, the groundlessness of which was proved by Marx and Engels in their "Communist Party Manifesto." If the "refuters" of Marxism-Leninism today are trying to prove that contemporary, i.e., state-monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism but some kind of new economic system which purportedly is developing in a noncapitalist manner, here again they are reiterating the long, worn-out claims which were exposed by Lenin in his work "The State and Revolution" nearly 70 years ago.

Incidentally, let us note that some bourgeois critics of scientific socialist ideology realize to a certain extent the groundlessness of the tactics of ignoring Marxism-Leninism. They realize that underestimating the growing influence of Leninist ideals in the contemporary capitalist world does not strengthen the positions of bourgeois ideology but rather discredits them. The reactionaries, Lenin pointed out, are frequently distinguished by the clarity of their class consciousness. They know what they want; they have no liberal illusions; they try to assess the situation soberly. This helps us to understand, for example, the statement by G. Rohrmoser, the West German anticommunist, who said that "Lenin himself saw the superiority of Marxism over the forces of bourgeois society in the fact that the latter are basically incapable of thinking in terms of long-term historical processes and to implement such thoughts through flexible and consistent tactics.

"The responsible forces in a liberal-bourgeois society are unable to do this, for they can see only the surface of the process, nothing but individual waves rather than a current flowing out of the depths of society. That is why they are also unable to act in a unified and cohesive way in accordance with a spirit of long-term social strategy. Unquestionably, recent experience has confirmed this forecast of Lenin" (G. Rohrmoser, "Ideenpolitische Perspektiven" [Perspectives of Political Ideas], Stuttgart, 1975, p 5).

The close reading of this statement is sufficient to gain a clear idea of the reasons for his forced admission. This reactionary emphasizes the ideological-political power of Marxism-Leninism and the effectiveness of its social strategy only for the sake of rallying the most conservative forces in the struggle against socialism. He criticizes the "liberal-bourgeois society" on the right, i.e., the bourgeois-democratic form of capital dictatorship. However limited formal and curtailed bourgeois democracy, trampled by the ruling class, may be, it is nevertheless presented by this supporter of imperialism as a hindrance in the struggle against socialism.

Imperialism, Lenin taught, is reaction along all lines. The transition from a system of free competition to a system of monopolies and to state-monopoly capitalism is consistent with the progressive limiting of bourgeois democracy and the suppression by capital of civil rights and the gains of the working people achieved as a result of a stubborn and fierce class struggle. The Imperialist bourgeoisie is turning fascist. It is the working class alone, allied with all working people, that can prevent the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in the biggest imperialist countries.

Therefore, even the acknowledgment of the outstanding ideological-political significance of Marxism-Leninism does not bring the bourgeois reactionary any closer to an accurate understanding of the true prospects of social development. The contemporary bourgeoisie is a class doomed by history, which is making desperate efforts to preserve its social positions, to preserve them at all cost, including unleashing a nuclear war on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. However, guided by Lenin's behests, the socialist states are steadily strengthening their defense, thus proving the futility of this "political madness" which, as Marx pointed out, is a characteristic feature of the ruling bourgeoisie (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 17, p. 51).

"Communist ideology, unlike bourgeois ideology," K. U. Chernenko points out, "attracts the minds and hearts of millions of people with its veracity and honesty, purposefulness and optimism. It is the ideology of the ascending class, the ideology of the new society, of peace and friendship among nations." This vivid and impressive description of Marxism-Leninism is a deep reflection of the almost 150-year-old history of the scientific ideology of the communist reorganization of the world, the historical experience of the liberation struggle waged by the working people and the building of a new socialist society and the universal historical role which Lenin played, as the greatest philosopher and political leader of our time, the lasting significance of whose ideological legacy is creatively enriched by the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist, communist and worker parties.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

100X

120: 100/1

PROCUREMENT DISCIPLINE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 58-67

[Article by Yu. Demin]

[Text] Partner's reliability.... Under contemporary conditions, when the scale of output has expanded immeasurably and with the development of specialization and cooperation, end results largely depend on reciprocal exigency and discipline shown by related enterprises, for a breakdown in goods suppl to the customer frequently triggers a chain reaction of breakdowns in the work rhythm and blocks the full utilization of production potential. Whereas at the start of the technological chain it is sometimes a question of parts worth a few kopecks, in the final account the damage is frequently measured in terms of tens or hundreds of thousands of rubles. This entails both material and moral losses: the working mood weakens and the moral-psychological climate in the collective worsens.

The broad economic experiment which has been under way since 1984 in five industrial sectors is aimed, in particular, at resolving the most important problem: observing contractual obligations relative to commodity deliveries. Its purpose is to strengthen state and planning discipline, to motivate labor collectives to make more efficient use of productive capital and material and manpower resources and apply intensive economic management methods more successfully. In accordance with its stipulations, on the one hand, the rights of production associations and enterprises are increased; on the other, so is their responsibility, including that of the strict observance of contractual obligations. Naturally, in the course of this experiment a great deal remains to be refined and perfected so that it may contribute to the greatest extent to upgrading the efficiency of the entire national economy.

Every manager, who expects of his business partners the honest and mandatory implementation of obligations, must put "his own home" in order: he must harness the people and concentrate the material-technical and organizational possibilities so that he himself will not let related enterprises down. Good results are achieved by collectives which persistently work on such problems and display initiative and economic mentality agility.

The Elektroapparat Production Association in Kursk has held the Red Challenge Banner of the Ministry of Electrical Industry and the Trade Union of Workers

in Electric Power Plants and the Central Committee of the Electrical Engineering Industry for the past 15 years. Based on work results during the 10th Five-Year Plan, it was presented with the high award of the Order of the Labor Red Banner; in 1983 it was declared the winner of the all-union socialist competition.

The association manufactures automatic circuit breakers, fast-acting fuses and other low-tension equipment. It has a small list of products--approximately 17 items. However, its output is based on customer specifications which are in excess of 100,000 varieties. In addition to wholesale, many of its customers purchase small batches. The association receives materials and complementing items from more than 1,500 enterprises throughout the country and supplies its products to 3,500 consumers. Understandably, considering such a widespread network of technological and marketing relations, remaining a reliable partner is no simple matter, for even the slightest breakdown in the work could seriously hinder the fulfillment of contractual obligations.

The people of Elektroapparat clearly understand that their main task is not merely to produce "values" but specific items needed by other enterprises for their successful work. Naturally, this attitude did not develop suddenly. It was helped by a major reorganization of intraplant planning, changes in the labor and production organization methods and in the systems of moral and material incentives and explanatory work in the collectives.

As we know, in an enterprise the production departments alone are frequently in charge of organizing the production process, while sales are the job of marketing departments. The former try to use the equipment at full capacity in order to fulfill volume indicators, whereas the latter limit their role to an intermediary mission, hastening to fulfill orders as rapidly as possible, frequently accepting the entire shop output and exerting virtually no influence on the course of the production process. As a result, neither planning nor production output are coordinated with contractual obligations which are dealt with by the marketing department. Two most important units--production and marketing--operate isolated from each other.

Several years ago the association undertook the radical reorganization of intraplant planning and the elimination of the old work stereotype and the established view that the most important thing was to meet the gross output assignment.

An effort was made above all to strengthen the role of the marketing department in the organization of planned procurements and production plans. In the past economists kept files on customer orders. They looked them over in drafting the monthly plan, selecting consumers with the largest orders, who were given priority in the plan. Frequently the so-called "petty orders" (accounting for 25 percent of the entire volume of output) were ignored and sometimes such orders were not even included in the plan.

Nevertheless, Elektroapparat fulfilled its production marketing assignment and paid fines for underprocurements. This lowered its profits but, as the saying goes, did not strike it a mortal blow. The victimized consumer was given a certain sum of money rather than goods, for which reason he failed to fulfill

his own assignments and, consequently, lost withholdings for the material incentive fund. The country's economy failed to obtain new material values and suffered losses.

"In the past customer vehicles stood guard around the association's enterprises waiting for the goods and 'pushers' shuttled around offices," V. G. Vlasov, the association's general director, says. "Every day dozens of telegrams were received by the party gorkom or obkom, in which consumers reported our lack of discipline. We were the oblast's leaders in the number of such telegrams and had become the talk of the town. Unquestionably, all of this affected the collective.... One of the reasons which prevented the accurate implementation of all contractual deliveries was difficulties in the manual processing of the files. Hence the existing attitude toward small orders. That is why the moment it became possible to mechanize the production management process, Elektroapparat tried to make use of this opportunity. Initially, together with the Kursk Polytechnical Institute, we tried to use punch cards. However, this proved unjustified because of the tremendous variety and huge number of accounts. Encouraging results were obtained only after the association was allocated a Minsk-32 computer."

As we know, at most enterprises the installation of automated control systems begins with the formulation of a production management subsystem. However, Elektroapparat deemed this method inexpedient and decided to begin with a customer delivery subsystem. N. D. Toktobayev, chief of the marketing department, was among the enthusiastic promoters of the project.

"He eagerly became part of the joint effort, and although wrongly, occasionally asked the computer to resolve problems which was not within its purview," recalls I. A. Chertov, chief of the information-computer center (IVTs). "In turn, we too were not always aware of all the aspects of marketing. Counterproposals were discussed, accepted or rejected. Such a creative association was quite useful. Suitable input and output forms were drafted including all parameters which were to be fed to the computer and problem algorithms. The computer began to supply the necessary information on the basis of such data. The new subsystem made it possible to organize strict accountability and control in the processing of orders at all stages, starting with their acceptance, setting up an orders portfolio, which is the base for the use of production facilities, and the production of the items needed at a precise time."

Orders have an element of irregularity: one month a large number of them are received for specific item models; the next month, few or no such items are requested. Whenever the computer indicates "overstocking" the marketing department gets in touch with customers, for some of them may have large stockpiles of some types of automatic circuit breakers or quick-break fuses but be short of other extremely necessary items. A mutually acceptable solution is then reached jointly. As a result, some orders are given first priority; others are given second priority while others again are relegated to a subsequent period. This makes it possible to optimize the load of production capacities and to reduce cases in which the association produces items which the consumer does not need at that particular time.

Nevertheless, despite such efforts, few orders may be received in a given month. This is a very alarming symptom, for it will disrupt the annual plan. Furthermore, that which does not have to be accomplished today may turn out to be exceptionally important tomorrow (the superior organization will not take into consideration the justification that the consumers did not order the goods on time and that subsequently production facilities were insufficient to meet all orders on time). In order to avoid such situations, the association updates the fulfillment of orders placed for subsequent months and ships out goods to the consumers ahead of schedule, although perfectly aware of the fact that by law consumers do not have to pay immediately for such goods (accounts receivable may exceed one million rubles in any given month). The collective does this deliberately, for it is in this way that it can make best use of its production capacities and, at the same time, meet customer demand.

The association developed other automated control subsystems subsequent to delivery control. This unified the work of the planning, marketing, production-dispatcher and IVTs departments in meeting orders, controlling the implementation of production plans and shipping finished goods to consumers.

We cannot say that the reorientation of the collective toward the strict implementation of contractual obligations was painless. Difficulties were experienced and doubts as to the successful application of the intraplant planning system were expressed. Initially, some production subunits even tried to keep their own "clandestine" files and to plan production shipments independently. Naturally, however, all such "double bookkeeping" achieved was confusion in the work. In the final account, the people realized that the active control of the orders portfolio, amended on a current basis, helped to formulate optimal plans and ensured their steady and prompt implementation.

The new procedure in assessing activities of enterprises and associations and regulating their material incentive based on the implementation of assignments and procurement obligations, introduced in 1978 by the Gosplan, Gossnab and USSR Central Statistical Administration, on the instructions of the USSR Council of Ministers, proved that Elektroapparat was following a proper direction in its work and was taking into consideration contemporary requirements.

However, life raised new problems and proved that the work could not be done routinely at all times: stockpiles of materials, as stipulated by the norms, and semifinished and finished items had to be available as insurance against possible breakdowns and interruptions. Thus, Elektroapparat must order from its suppliers the materials it needs at the proper time--in April--for a year in advance, in accordance with the so-called draft plan. This made it necessary to anticipate consumer orders. Naturally, such projections were somewhat different from those planned. Suppliers frequently let their customers down by failing to ship their goods on time. Furthermore, the Kursk Automotive Transport Administration provides the association with trucks only for shipping out finished goods. Therefore, in order to fulfill its plan on time and not let related enterprises down, Elektroapparat is occasionally forced to use its own vehicles to pick up materials hundreds of kilometers away; such vehicles are used inefficiently; the drivers cannot fulfill their current obligations and there are fuel overexpenditures. All of this

increases production costs. During the past few years the efforts of the collective have been concentrated on resolving these problems.

The production-dispatcher department paid particular attention to coordinating the work of procurement and assembly shops and the creation of optimal comprehensive stockpiles of semifinished goods for each item. This made it possible to implement contractual obligations rhythmically and without delays (even if some materials are not received on time). Initially the assembly shops were issued nomenclature assignments no less than 2 weeks before the beginning of the next month, so that they could be prepared in advance and create the necessary stockpiles. Small orders, information about which is provided by the computer, are included in the first month of the new quarter. As a result, 20 to 25 percent of more such items must be produced compared to the subsequent months. Although the fulfillment of such a plan by the shop is more difficult, it guarantees the fact that even the small customers will not be let down and that the quarterly program will be fulfilled. It was thus that all consumers--big and small--were given equal rights.

The creation and steady maintenance of unfinished stockpiles proved to be difficult. The head plant had not been built according to a plan but raised from the ruins in 1946. Because of insufficient space (it covers no more than 3.5 hectares) the entire increase in output is still exclusively the result of technical retooling (efforts are made to purchase increasingly productive machinery) and the compact location of the equipment. Facilities for storing parts, semifinished goods and materials were insufficient. Two depots were built, which required narrowing access byways to the utmost.

The necessary stockpiles were created at the beginning of the fourth quarter of 1983. This was helped by the fact that by then the superior organization had approved a special regulation on awarding bonuses to the personnel of services which established and maintained such stockpiles on the necessary level.

In order to exclude "recurrences of the past," i.e., the possibility of compensating for the nonfulfillment of the plan for some items by producing other items unnecessary at that time, the following strict rule was established: the warehouse (controlled by the marketing department) will accept only finished items as stipulated in the plan. This strengthened control over the implementation of assignments for the entire variety of items.

Naturally, it is not enough to produce the goods on time. They must also be shipped to the consumer on time. The responsible officials at the warehouse are issued monthly revised plans for accepting and shipping out finished goods and data on what remains to be delivered to the individual consumers before the end of the quarter. Deciding on the basis of computer data what is to be shipped out and to whom and when, they try to reduce the number but increase the volume of shipments to individual consumers.

The association has established long-term business relations with a number of suppliers, as a result of which now the Mikroprovod Plant in Podolsk, the Emal'provod Plant in Tskhinvali in South Ossetia and other enterprises are

making regular shipments. Not everything went smoothly at first: in the past, for example, Emal'provod frequently delivered to the association substandard goods. Elektroapparat representatives visited the enterprise and determined that obsolete technology was the main reason for this. They secured the agreement of the ministry to supply the enterprise with new equipment, which put an end to complaints. Association designers and technologists met with personnel of similar services at the Elektrokontakt Plant in Kineshma and repeatedly discussed problems of improving the quality of delivered items and the conservation of all types of resources, including precious metals. For example, they were able through joint efforts to lower the weight of contacts (without worsening their quality or durability), which enabled them to save more than 12.5 tons of silver during the last five-year plan alone.

The association has persistently worked on the solution of these and other problems for some 6 years. This has yielded results. Elektroapparat fulfilled its plan for all deliveries for the first time during the first quarter of 1983. This inspired the people. The collective entered 1984, the year of the broad economic experiment, with an already largely developed system of intraplant planning, strict control over fulfilling orders at all production stages and the creation of insurance stockpiles.

The role of the implementation of contractual obligations becomes even greater in the experiment. According to the new regulation, if the partners ship out 100 percent of the stipulated goods, the material incentive fund of the association is increased by 15 percent. Even if 0.2 percent of the contractual obligations remain unfulfilled, the bonus is reduced by 30 percent; a 0.5 nonfulfillment lowers the bonus by one-half and no one is given a bonus with a 1 percent underfulfillment rate. Tempting possibilities appeared of using the saved share of the wage fund, for this amount will be left entirely at the disposal of the management and the trade union committee which can jointly increase the wages of skilled workers from 16 to 50 percent of the wage or salary rate, including also for active contribution to the implementation of contractual obligations. No deadline for wage supplements is set: if someone's work worsens the supplement is eliminated. Therefore, henceforth the successful work of the Elektroapparat collective will be backed by a more flexible and equitable material incentive system.

The activities of the association's party committee and the entire primary party organization largely contributed to the implementation of contractual obligations. Discussions on the nature and significance of the economic experiment, its sociopolitical aspects and the new responsible assignments facing the party members and all working people and the need to strengthen labor, production and planning discipline were held at open party meetings last year at the head plant and the branches. The same problems were actively discussed within the party and Komsomol training and economic education systems. The party committee tries to deploy the party members in such a way as to have a party group at each production sector. This also applies to brigades which today employ three-quarters of all production workers. One of the commissions of the party organization in charge of controlling administrative activities directly deals with problems of observing procurement discipline. The work of the association and its party members is steadily studied by the superior party organs whose personnel studied the

situation and the results of political education measures on the spot and helped to surmount arising difficulties.

The personnel of the marketing department suggested that output planning be based on 10-day rather than monthly periods, for if the assignment of the assembly shop involves a number of types of operation it tries to organize its production as follows: it will produce one item initially, in order to meet the monthly requirement, without having to reset the conveyor belt, followed by a second, a third, etc. Accordingly, some items are delivered to the warehouse during the final days of the month, as a result of which the warehouse personnel are unable to put together dozens of orders and to ship them in containers before the month is over. On an experimental basis two assembly shops were issued 10-day production plans for several items. Understandably, each one of them had to work on producing the same item. This made the work much more difficult. The party members persistently explained to the workers the purpose of the experiment, the need strictly to observe performance discipline and to take national interests into consideration. At the same time, they argued that the implementation of the nomenclature plan is one of the most important indicators in determining the size of the bonus (which could be as high as one-quarter of the monthly earnings). Substantial results were obtained: the volume of carryover items in the warehouses declined by a factor of 2.3; goods were delivered on a comprehensive basis and efficiently shipped to the consumers. Further efforts are being made along this line.

In the past little attention was paid to warehousing operations at Elektroapparat. Under the new conditions, however, controlling the warehouse proved to be almost as difficult as controlling the production process because of the large number of customers. Occasionally there is a shortage of containers and putting orders together on time, taking into consideration available items and the directions in which the railroad will accept freight on a daily basis is no easy matter. Yet the end results of the efforts of a thousands-strong association collective depend on the results of the work of several dozen dispatchers and assembling, packaging and loading personnel.

Putting together the various items in the warehouse for shipment to specific customers does not always yield optimal results. It is difficult and frequently impossible to take into consideration a great variety of factors. In the third quarter of this year a new computer will be installed in the association, whose memory will be greater than the current one by a factor of 6. With its help shipments of finished products and day-to-day control will be planned on a daily basis. This will also change the wage system for warehouse personnel. Currently their wages depend on the volume of goods put together, for which reason it is always more profitable to begin by assembling batches for big customers. The plan is to make the workers interested in covering the broadest range of consumers. This will be the purpose of the socialist competition and of material and moral incentives based on competition results.

The competition is scheduled to play a great role in ensuring the maintenance of contractual discipline. It must not be considered as something external, as an addition to the organization of the production process but as its

intrinsic element. The experiment makes the party and trade union organizations in the association take a new look at labor competition problems. Here is what D. V. Men'shov, trade union committee chairman, thinks on this subject:

"We still have too many indicators on which competition results are based. There were 28 of them and now there are 14; there are seven for technological chains and brigades. Some people say that the more indicators there are the more objective the competition results become. I, however, think that only four basic indicators should remain: quantity and quality of output, variety and production regularity. No one could accidentally win in this case. No one could claim victory if plans for the volume of output and variety remain unfulfilled. The coefficients of quality, rejects, goods returned for further processing, number of claims and labor regularity by 10-day periods are clear and indisputable figures.... How frequently should competition results be determined? Wherever production conditions make this possible, preferably on a daily basis. However, the association includes sectors whose technological cycle takes several days. Since we firmly link procurement discipline to competition results, such results could be summed up on a 10-day basis for assembly workers and in some other shops, based on end work results.... The data of the four competition criteria will be fed to the new computer and the results will be published immediately so that everyone can see the quality of his work.... We must also develop related competition among enterprises. Today, unfortunately, the partners assume toward each other moral obligations only. In my view, we should begin by making withholdings from related enterprise funds for a material incentive fund for workers who have contributed the most to the implementation of contractual obligations. In the future, hopefully, the AUCCTU and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems will clearly define reciprocal rights and obligations of collectives within a technological chain and appoint referees to determine the results of the interdepartmental labor competition."

The association's personnel think, seek, analyze and argue. A study of their opinions and suggestions confirms once again how timely was the decision made by the party and the government to undertake this economic experiment, one of whose tasks is to give scope to initiative. The people are working jointly and organizedly. During the first and second quarters the collective once again met its delivery plan entirely and pledged to complete its quarterly contractual obligations by the 27th of the last month and to complete the annual assignments for delivery of items to enterprises within the agroindustrial complex and for export by 20 December.

The example of the Elektroapparat Production Association in Kursk indicates the importance of eliminating existing stereotypes and developing a new type of economic thinking and directing the collective and the management system toward end results--the prompt and qualitative filling of consumer orders. A number of enterprises are successfully resolving this problem. They include the Svetlana and LOMO production associations in Leningrad, the Krasny Proletariy Machine Tool-Building Association and the ZIL in Moscow, the tractor plants in Vladimir and Minsk and others. In 1983 the plan for production marketing based on concluded contracts and accepted orders for the

country at large was fulfilled nearly 98 percent, compared to 97 percent in 1982.

However, so far no radical improvements have taken place in strengthening contractual discipline. In still frequent cases, motivated by departmental or parochial interests, enterprises violate deadlines for shipping goods to planned consumers in amounts smaller than stipulated and, furthermore, some of them without orders. They compensate the considerable fines they pay for delivery failures by generating additional profits which include compensations they receive from other careless partners. However, such fines merely create an illusion that a struggle is being waged against violations of procurement discipline. This is merely a transfer of funds from one enterprise to another or, more accurately, from one state pocket to another.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree on observing contractual obligations for commodity procurements demands of ministry collegiums and ministers personally to increase their control over the work of subordinate enterprises and to take effective steps to ensure the timely and full implementation of contractual deliveries and to prevent the production of unordered or unrequested goods. "...I would like to draw the attention of our ministers and department managers to the fact that their role and responsibility in resolving national economic problems is exceptionally great and comprehensive," Comrade K. V. Chernenko pointed out at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "This involves personal creativity and initiative-minded activities and the ability and capability of organizing the joint and cohesive work of subordinate enterprises and organizations, as well as efficient interaction in resolving problems involving related enterprises."

The experiment will be developed in scope and depth. All its valuable and justified features will be retained and during the 12th Five-Year Plan the new means and methods of economic management will be extensively applied in economic management practices. It would be expedient in this connection to make a close study of suggestions made by the collectives of Elektroapparat and other enterprises throughout the country. Some of them should be considered in greater detail.

Unfortunately, not all ministries have been able as yet truly to reorganize their work and to undertake to resolve the problem of the strict implementation of contracts not formally but in essence. Occasionally, the lowering of bonuses of an enterprise for nonfulfillment of deliveries is followed by substantial material incentives to managers based on other indicators. Frequently suppliers are granted an odd "indulgence" in the form of reducing the percentage of nonfulfillment of contractual obligations. If the nonfulfillment does not exceed 2 or 3 percent of the total value of procurements, the association, plant or factory is not entirely deprived of its bonus (the amount of which is merely reduced). The explanation is that the enterprise is not always the only culprit for the violation of contractual obligations (occasionally production assignments are not balanced with raw material resources; obligations are drafted and issued to the enterprises and procurement authorities with great delays, as a result of which at the beginning of the year a number of associations, plants and factories have not received their full portfolio of orders. They do not know where the rest,

complementing items and some raw materials will come from). However, this indicator of lack of discipline allows the enterprises to shirk responsibility even if they themselves are responsible for the breakdowns. It is used to conceal economic sluggishness and is a guarantee for carefree life. If the implementation of procurements is hindered by objective reasons, they should be taken into consideration in commodity production and distribution plans. The amounts included in the plan should be manufactured and shipped on time unconditionally, for reinsurance of procurement shortfalls violates the balanced nature of the national economy and as long as this exists the necessary proportionality in public production will be hard to achieve. That is why most economists, scientists and practical workers call for the elimination of such reinsurance.

Naturally, this is a complex problem the solution of which requires, above all, for each enterprise to use its production capacity in accordance with the established portfolio of orders, to create the necessary materials and unfinished goods insurance stockpiles and to organize strict control of warehouses in accepting nothing but finished goods stipulated in the plan and ship them to the consumers promptly. Unfortunately, by no means all associations, enterprises or procurement and marketing organizations have computers. Furthermore, some of them are unwilling to purchase them. They find it more advantageous to keep track of procurements manually--on a consolidated basis rather than broken down by hundreds or thousands of contracts covering the entire variety of output shipped to customers.

The procurement plan should be one of the main indicators of activity of production collectives, their managers and the sectorial ministries. However, associations and enterprises continue to receive production marketing plans in which contractual deliveries and orders are not assessed in terms of value and on an individual basis. This means that subsequently the level of implementation of contractual obligations cannot be assessed accurately. This introduces subjective elements in procurement planning and accounting.

The value of underprocurements is assessed in wholesale prices in determining the actual implementation of contractual obligations. Under such circumstances, inexpensive "petty items" insufficiently influence the final indicator. For example, the delayed shipment of 1,000 parts worth 3 kopecks each, totaling 30 rubles, is considered by the procurer a lesser evil than failure to deliver a single assembly worth 100 rubles. From the customer's viewpoint matters are different: the lack of small parts will prevent him from assembling completely 1,000 machines while the lack of a single assembly will affect one machine only. Clearly, the USSR Gosplan and State Committee for Labor and Social Problems should develop an indicator of fulfillment of contractual obligations which would determine more completely and accurately the degree of culpability of the related enterprise in violating the contract, based on the resulting damage.

How should procurement violations be fought? The following opinions have been expressed: clearly, the amount of fines should not be increased. The payment of substantial fines worsens the situation of enterprises and objectively hinders the correction of shortcomings. It would be equally incorrect to lower existing economic incentive funds of careless suppliers, for such funds

are set up and used collectively, where the failure of a contract may be traced to a few individual workers. It is also quite important for such personnel to be held materially liable. Naturally, the fines they must pay will be relatively small and will not compensate for the damages caused. However, such a step would enhance their performing discipline and decision-making responsibility.

Responsibility for the violation of procurement discipline should be related, i.e., it should be extended to the ministries as well which, particularly in formulating the plan and subsequently correcting it, occasionally fail to take into proper account the production possibilities of their enterprises.

In recent years, for example, the Dinamo Electrical Machine Building Association in Moscow was forced to pay substantial fines. All of them were due to the fact that whenever the plan was being drafted it "suddenly" became clear that the capacities with which some of the items were to be produced had not been installed. Or else an extraordinary order would be placed, the assignment of which to another enterprise was considered risky.... However, as we know, miracles do not happen. As a result, fines totaling several million rubles piled up. S. V. Demidovich, the association's general director, decided on a desperate step which became the talk of economic circles: he readdressed the fines...to the Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry. This economic step (although the fines nevertheless had to be paid) yielded results: the capacities of the plant were assessed in detail and the real needs of the consumers were defined.

The party committees of ministries and departments must upgrade the personal responsibility of the party members within the apparatus in observing performing discipline and assessing on a principled basis manifestations of departmentalism and parochialism. The apparatus personnel responsible for failures in reciprocal procurements should be held morally and materially liable for the harm caused the national economy as a result of their official slackness and inefficiency. At the same time, material incentives should be provided for workers within the apparatus who have contributed to the successful application of the new economic management methods.

Naturally, any collective which deserves a bonus for successful work should receive it unconditionally and promptly. According to the experiment, enterprises which meet their obligations to their partners fully, mandatorily receive a substantial addition to their material incentive fund. However, this rarely occurs in practice.

The point is that the sources for increasing such funds come from the reserves of ministries and industrial associations, or if such funds are unavailable, from the above-plan profits of enterprises. However, frequently the reserve fund does not exceed 8-10 percent of the sum total of the ministry's funds and, as a rule, is used for other purposes. As to its own above-plan profit, the enterprise may either not earn it at all or else its amount may not be sufficient for increasing the incentive fund. Even if an enterprise has such funds at its disposal additional payments to the workers are difficult. In particular, the Moscow Automotive Vehicle and Tractor Electrical Equipment Plant (ATE-1), which is fulfilling all customer orders in full and regularly,

had to wait several months for the special permission of the USSR Ministry of Finance to pay a bonus to the collective, based on annual results. In our view a situation in which an enterprise cannot freely exercise its right to additional incentives for successful implementation of contractual obligations cannot be considered normal.

Procurement discipline also largely depends on the efficient work of material and technical supply, transportation and other agencies which must ensure the uninterrupted and rhythmical flow of the production process. For example, if a container or a freight car is not full delays develop in shipping materials, complementing goods or finished items as additional freight is picked up along the way.

As we know, the USSR Gosplan passed a special decree on ensuring the prompt and full availability of material facilities to associations and enterprises operating under the new working conditions. Its procurement and marketing authorities issue orders to specified consumers, marked "experiment," which must be filled on a priority basis. Obviously, however, it would be expedient to display another useful initiative, such as taking over some marketing operations through its territorial management bodies, for it is far more advantageous to enterprises to conclude a single contract rather than a hundred contracts with the territorial administration of the USSR Gosplan and to receive "petty items" from the warehouse nearby rather than to wait until it can receive a fully loaded railroad car or container. This would make it possible to choose among the various transport facilities on the basis of economical utilization. Furthermore, the enterprises would free warehousing space for the development of new capacities and the possibility of better organizing material and technical procurement and marketing would appear.

Practical experience indicates that the failure of contractual obligations as a result of breakdowns in the transportation system have become the rule rather than the exception. Nevertheless, it is the manufacturer who is blamed for delayed shipments. The transportation personnel are still not held liable. Managers of associations, plants, factories and enterprise supply and marketing departments have expressed the thought that workers in the rail, automotive, marine and river transportation should be held materially liable for the strict implementation of their duty to haul the goods.

The purpose of the economic experiment is to improve the economic mechanism and to provide an atmosphere which would favor the maximal display of initiative, the development of the social activeness of all worker categories, the surmounting of mental stereotypes and shedding light on existing problems and thus preparing the grounds for their best practical solution. Naturally, such work cannot be postponed to the end of the experiment. Prompt deliveries are one of the principles of socialist economic management and the most important prerequisite for the steady growth of public production efficiency.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

0002

000: 1302/1

HALF-FACED TO THE REGION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 68-77

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences K. Pankova, deputy director of the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agricultural Economics]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On the Comprehensive Development of Agriculture in the Areas of Siberia, the Far East and Kurgan Oblast" and the country's Food Program for the period through 1990 presume the extensive application of the achievements of science and technology in agricultural production. Scientific forces, the extent of whose participation will largely determine the efficient utilization of resources allocated for agricultural intensification in the eastern part of the country, are being extensively recruited to assist party, soviet and economic bodies.

The role of science in general and of economics in particular in resolving said problem make us think of possibilities of upgrading research efficiency. The agrarian scientists are motivated in this case by the continuing lack of agricultural production behind the requirements of the national economy.

Extensive possibilities exist of increasing the efficiency of scientific research. Their utilization promises comprehensive unquestionable and substantial success. The procedure for cadre selection and placement, upgrading methodical and theoretical research standards and the utilization of progressive methods in their organization are consistent with the interests of this project. This also includes the use of contemporary ways and means of gathering, processing and storing data and improving the system for stimulating scientific activities.

In the final account, it is a question of science, as was emphasized at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, for science to make a decisive turn toward the real, the practical problems raised by life. In analyzing the prerequisite for such a turn we first come across forms of organization of scientific research which are hardly fully consistent with the problems which science must resolve today. This conclusion is confirmed by the practice of organizing scientific work in the area of agricultural economics in Siberia.

The economic development of new Siberian areas, the increased size of the industrial urban population which this triggered, including migration to the

cities by the population of villages and hamlets in the area, changed the ratio of supply and demand of agricultural products. Their increased production could not catch up with rapidly increasing demand. Imports from other economic parts of the country became necessary. On an average, during the 10th Five-Year Plan, the consumption of milk and dairy products, meat and meat products and vegetables and eggs increased on a per capita basis. However, the recommended standard has not been reached as yet.

Yet experience in Siberian farming indicates that with a proper organization of the production process, the soil and climatic conditions would enable us to obtain high crop yields and high cattle productivity in areas covering wide latitudes. For example, the Zavodoukovskoye and Topolya experimental-production farms (Northern Trans-Urals) harvest respectively 40 and 30 quintals of grain per hectare. The Experimental-Production Farm imeni Frunze (Omsk Oblast) averages about 40 quintals and the Irkutsk Experimental-Production Farm, more than 30 quintals. Here milk production per cow averages 5,000 kilograms per year and the Cherepanovskoye OPKh [Experimental-Production Farm] (Novosibirsk Oblast) averages nearly 4,500 kilograms. Live weight increases in cattle have averaged in some OPKh 700 grams daily. Based on the achievements of the leading farms, it would be entirely realistic for Siberian grain crops to increase by 40 to 50 percent compared with previous results, to ensure sufficient animal feed production and to develop the eastern region not only as an industrially but an agriculturally developed area.

In the search for the shortest way leading to changes in the agrarian sector and the adoption of means and methods for the fuller utilization of soil, climatic and economic possibilities of the area, today practical agriculture can rely on science and its recommendations. It would be no exaggeration to say that during its existence the Siberian Regional Department of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V. I. Lenin has developed into a powerful scientific system which includes more than 20 scientific research institutes and more than 20 agricultural stations. It has more than 60 experimental production farms in which scientific developments undergo practical testing.

Unfortunately, in this family of research institutions the science of economics is represented by only a single scientific research institute whose scientific staff numbers slightly over 100 people. The institute's field of activities is huge. It covers agriculture in the entire eastern region, from the Urals on the West to the Pacific in the east, from the shores of the Arctic Ocean on the north to the dry steppes of the Kalash SSR to the south. The vastness of this territory predetermines the exceptional variety of natural zones not only on a regional scale but within its krais, oblasts and autonomous republics the land area of which is vaster than some large union republics. This not only creates a corresponding variety of farming methods but also some additional organizational difficulties in the work of scientific institutions.

If we take as a base the availability of agro-economic cadres in the European part of the USSR or the country at large, in terms of Siberian conditions we may speak of the expediency and need of having not one but at least three institutes engaged in the study of economic problems of Siberian agriculture,

one per economic rayon. This problem can be resolved by reassigning in favor of Siberia of scientific cadres and the reallocation of scientific development funds.

However, even if the problem of such a redistribution is resolved positively, its practical implementation is no simple matter, not to mention its implementation within a suitably short time. The question is how to organize the efficient study of the area's agrarian economic problems under contemporary conditions? Obviously, this can be achieved by concentrating available forces along the most important lines of Siberian agricultural production.

In scientific work, as in any other area of social practice, such problems must be resolved with the help of planning. It is precisely in the course of the formulation of the plan that production requirements and scientific possibilities appear and the best forms of scientific-production relations and ties are defined. A thoroughly adjusted, substantiated and timely drafted plan is a necessary initial prerequisite for efficient scientific work. Planning methods and the material incentive system should contribute to the combination of science with production.

Bearing in mind the purpose of the scientific institutions of the Siberian Department of VASKHNIL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V. I. Lenin], the region's agriculture should be the main customer of the scientific research economic institute in planning its work through the respective oblast, kray and autonomous republic administrative authorities, for we could not expect a single Siberian-wide solution of all problems due to the variety of conditions in which the region's sovkhozes and kolkhozes organize their work.

For example, the means and methods of intensive truck gardening in Kemerovo Oblast will differ from those in Novosibirsk or Omsk oblasts, because of the nature of location of industrial enterprises and concentration of the urban population. Problems of organizing auxiliary farms by industrial enterprises must also be resolved differently in newly developed and already inhabited areas in Siberia. The steps which must be taken to ensure the economic upsurge of losing farms in Kulunda will differ from those of Baraba, for the reasons for their losses are different. In areas of repeated droughts problems of labor wages arise, which are not to be found in areas with sufficiently stable moisture. The organization of sheep breeding in Chita Oblast is different from that in Khakasiya. The administrative units in the region greatly vary in terms of the nature of their food problems and the means to resolve them. In other words, actually regional problems are broken down into the problems of individual oblasts, krays and autonomous republics which, one would think, should act as customers and consumers of scientific products. Unfortunately, this is not the case currently: according to the existing procedure, the list of research projects for the forthcoming planning period is drawn up for the area by central and leading scientific institutions in the country. All assignments received from them are considered mandatory and their implementation is supervised by state statistical bodies, which makes any opposition to the decisions very difficult.

This does not indicate in the least any rejection of the need for a centralized base in science. It is not a question of an absolute autonomy of peripheral scientific institutions or neglect of authority. The guiding influence of a center for the development of scientific research in the country is objectively necessary. At the same time, however, we should answer the question of the ways, means and nature of centralized scientific management, for its advantages are not unlimited even in industry. It is no accident that the problem of the most expedient correlation between the role of the center and the local areas in management has been resolved differently in the different development stages of the Soviet economy. This problem is even more relevant in scientific activities, for its rigid vertical control inevitably weakens the necessary freedom of scientific thinking.

How is the planning of scientific activities by the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agriculture Economics emerging this five-year plan?

Noteworthy above all is the large number of institutions with the right to "drop" assignments on it from above. More than a dozen such institutions exist, all of them at a great distance from Siberia. In addition to the State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR Gosplan and Ministry of Agriculture, they include the following: the Council for the Study of Production Forces, the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Scientific Research Institute of the Ministry of Agriculture and VASKHNIL in Moscow, Moscow Oblast, Rostov-na-Donu, Stavropol, Drel, Minsk and Ryazan. All of them issue specific assignments on a rather arbitrary basis but which are considered, nevertheless, mandatory. Let us add that not one such institution is responsible to the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Economics for financial and manpower support of assignments. The VASKHNIL Siberian Department receives the science funds for its institutes on the basis of the tables of organization, directly from the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The institute began to receive assignments for the current five-year plan only at the end of 1951 and as late as through the middle of 1952. Meanwhile, it was forced to remain in a state of expectation and to do research on the basis of a provisional plan.

After all assignments were in, it turned out that different departments had issued duplicating ones. For example, an assessment of material outlay norms was received from the USSR Gosplan (April 1950), the USSR Ministry of Agriculture (March 1951) and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology (June 1951). Some of the assignments were either simply unnecessary or else should not have been issued to a regional economic scientific research institute. For example, estimates of the level of consumption of food products by population category and the balance of production and distribution of agricultural commodities in producing farms is annually drawn up by the state statistical authorities. In accordance with the plan, however, the same work was carried out on a parallel basis by Siberian scientific institutions. Another example was the assignment issued to the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agricultural Machinery of determining the normative outlays for repairs of tractors, combines and other agricultural equipment. It would have been more logical to assign this to specialized technical scientific research institutes or manufacturing plants.

The assignments to the institute should also include the elaboration of standardized forms for planning and accounting documents suitable for machine processing, although the institute has no computers with which to experiment with possibilities of such processing. Furthermore, such problems are the prerogative of union or republic institutions.

The regional scientific research institutes are systematically issued assignments on computing numerous norms for consolidated five-year planning. Such work is being done manually. It requires extensive information and is of a purely technical nature, as a result of which the State Committee for Science and Technology does not even classify it as scientific research. Meanwhile, the modern computing facilities at the disposal of central planning authorities make centralized computations based on standard programs quite possible. Had the central departments not had "disciplined" peripheral scientific research institutes on hand, the problem would have long been resolved on the necessary technical level.

Meanwhile, the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agriculture was forced to prove its right to participate in the study of topics with which it has dealt traditionally without being considered as a performer by the plan of the State Committee for Science and Technology. This involves the utilization and specialization of agriculture in Siberia and long-range development trends, an area in which the institute has already submitted a number of important production suggestions. For example, it has been estimated that the assignment of areas under grain crops alone by expanding areas planted in rye in the pre-taiga areas could yield approximately an additional 150,000 tons of grain. The more accurate location of dairy and cattle breeding and, correspondingly, areas planted in fodder crops and the development of intensive suburban agriculture areas promise great benefits.

The entire 18-month period of the rather painful process of drawing up the plan for scientific work for 1981-1985 was accompanied by unprofitable correspondence and telephone talks and multiple visits of clients for all sorts of coordination purposes.

Unrestricted freedom in assigning co-performers and in drawing up lists of research topics and the total lack of concern for supporting them with manpower and financial resources result in the development of inadmissible ratios between the amounts of planned projects and the number of scientific cadres. This affects particularly painfully economic subunits with small staffs, which are part of some scientific research institutes of the VASKHNIL Siberian department. Thus, the department of economics of the Krasnoyarsk Scientific Research Agricultural Institute, which has a staff of only a few people, and the All-Union Scientific Research Agricultural Planning and Norming Institute (Rostov-na-Donu) were assigned to develop in the course of this five-year plan more than 10 different norms for the entire East Siberian areas. Yet this small collective must, furthermore, deal with other matters as well.

This is not to say in the least that all assignments issued to the institute by the head institutions and included in its topic plan do not reflect the problems facing Siberian agriculture. The problem lies elsewhere--in the

practical orientation of the research output. The point is that the recipients of the results of scientific developments of the Siberian Scientific Research Institute of Agricultural Economics are also their customers, i.e., they are the head establishment and institutes. It is in accordance with their requirements that the study of various problems is organized and it is they which receive the intermediary and the final results of research projects. They combine such data with reports submitted by other co-participants, who may number in the dozens on some topics. One can imagine the level of concreteness and practical usefulness of such a consolidated document which has encompassed the results of specific studies.

Matters would have been different had the institute's plans been based on requests submitted by local Siberian customers. In this case the institute's collective would be issued a specific project (rather than something applicable to the whole of Siberia as is the case now) for its research. Institutions granted the real right of resolving problems in the application of scientific research would become interested in its results. The research itself, bearing in mind its direct practical purpose, would be conducted far more thoroughly.

Under circumstances in which planning the work of a regional scientific research institute is extremely centralized, any efficient correction of the plan, dictated by life, becomes virtually impossible. The solution of such problems is either postponed or reached outside the plan. This only works to the detriment of planned and unplanned projects. It is no accident that the scientists were insufficiently prepared for submitting specific tested suggestions on many problems based, for example, on steps to streamline agricultural management as well as other stipulations aimed at improving work in this sector and in the agroindustrial complex as a whole. The unconditional observance in scientific research of a strictly established long-term plan which inevitably becomes morally obsolete benefits neither science nor practice.

For example, the assignment issued by the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology for 1981-1985 did not specifically stipulate topics related to the Food Program or problems of the work of rayon or oblast agroindustrial associations, the brigade contracting method and cost accounting (including internal cost accounting). Nor did it include an expansion of the General Plan for the Development and Location of Agriculture in Siberia and the Far East for the Period Through the Year 2000 or the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress in Agriculture in the Area Through the Year 2005. Many of the practically most useful works of the institute, consistent with present-day requirements and needs of the area, were considered outside the plan. They included "Scientific Foundations and a System of Measures Relative to the Food Program in Novosibirsk Oblast" (agrarian block); "Basic Directions in the Development of Intensive Suburban Agricultural Zones," "Recommendations for the Organization of Intracost Accounting," "Recommendations on the Organization-Economic Substantiation of the Rayon Agroindustrial Association," etc.

The current method for encouraging scientific work is another factor contributing to the reduced regional topics covered in the institute's

activities. In summing up its results, developments on the oblast level are rated as being only one-third of the value of the developments on the union-wide level. Studies conducted in an individual farm are rated as one point only, which is lower than the assessment of a project conducted on the republic level by a factor of 8. This rating scale is inconsistent with the degree of the scientific and practical value of developments and does not correspond in the least to the actual role which kolkhozes, sovkhoses, rayons and oblasts play in implementing the specific tasks of the Food Program.

The situation which developed with planning and organizing research on Siberian agricultural economics cannot fail to concern us. It is entirely clear that science today is already able to do a great deal more for the region's agriculture and thus to justify its direct purpose. A number of problems have developed in Siberian agricultural production which need an urgent solution.

For example, Siberia has a great deal of open land which, however, is either inappropriate or totally unsuitable for agriculture. Without denying the need to put some of it in agricultural circulation in special cases, we must remember that the already developed farmland should be the main source for increasing the volume of regional food resources. The increased pace of Siberian agricultural intensification is also dictated by its closer dependence on weather conditions and the rapidly growing need for food products (between 1966 and 1980 the number of people employed in industry in Western and Eastern Siberia increased by nearly 28 percent while the number of people engaged in agriculture dropped by 15 percent). To this day, compared with other economic areas in Russia, the resources obtained by Siberia in terms of the land used are considerably fewer. This gap has continued to increase. Over the past 10 years the lag has increased from 36 to 40 percent for capital investments and from 38 to 41 percent for capital asset availability. During the 10th Five-Year Plan only one-third of the amount of fertilizer per hectare used by kolkhozes and sovkhoses in other oblasts of the Russian Federation was applied in Siberia.

Compared with demand, the overall limitation of resources in the country does not allow us to expect that the gap in material and technical procurements for Siberian agriculture will be closed as rapidly as we would wish. Therefore, we must find optimal variants for the structure and distribution of allocated investments which would enable us better to implement the long-term plans for intraregional deployment and specialization of Siberian agriculture and resolve more successfully the problem of the accelerated reorganization of production and social facilities in lagging enterprises. It is equally important to formulate specific ways of upgrading the efficiency of the utilization of available material resources in Siberian oblasts, krais and autonomous republics.

The region's economists face a number of problems raised by the new system of management of the food complex, which is still in its formative process. Its basic stipulations have already been applied. However, extensive work remains to be done in terms of their details and concrete projects and for summing up in 1984 and 1985 the experience acquired in the use of the new forms of

economic relations between agricultural enterprises and other sectors within the agroindustrial complex.

The cost accounting principles have been violated in the activities of agricultural enterprises. This is confirmed, among others, by the increased percentage of budget allocations and borrowed funds to meet production expenditures of kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Efforts to intensify economic work and intracost accounting in these enterprises against a background of virtually unlimited annual compensation for losses in agriculture and an essentially unlimited access to loans will bring no success. There is a need for extensive and comprehensive interdisciplinary scientific study the purpose of which will be to create a substantiated system of cost accounting incentives which would make work based on older methods unprofitable.

The question of purchase prices is particularly relevant in Siberia, as an unstable farming area (for example, between 1976 and 1981 average grain crop yields in Novosibirsk Oblast ranged between 8 and 17 quintals per hectares). Such prices must absolutely ensure to agricultural enterprises a compensation for production expenditures and accumulations in any farm year. This is a mandatory law of socialist economic management. According to the constant purchase prices for agriculture commodities, currently applied, due to conditions independent of their will the kolkhozes and sovkhoses experience great shortages of funds. This drastically worsens their normal reproduction cycle. It is true that the cash shortages are compensated by state financial reserves. Such a measure, however, proves to be too late. It cannot be considered satisfactory also from the viewpoint of cost accounting requirements.

It would be quite reasonable to apply in agriculture purchase prices differentiated by year and based on the biological crop. In this case there would be no need to increase the subsidies needed to meet sectorial needs. The reason is that the higher losses experienced by agriculture during lean years, when goods are sold at prices lower than production costs, are currently compensated, one way or another, out of state budget funds. The new purchase prices, based on the size of the crop, would help to strengthen the cost accounting base of sovkhos and kolkhoz production activities. In such a case problems of the efficient specialization of the farms could be resolved more energetically. The objection may be that unstable prices based on the size of the crop would not be different from the constant incentives given for fulfilling and overfulfilling annual production plans by agricultural workers. This objection, however, sounds unconvincing, for today as well assignments are issued to the collectives in physical rather than monetary measurement units.

The results of several previous 5-year periods have indicated that the hope of eliminating losses in agriculture sectors and enterprises mainly with the help of differentiated zonal purchase prices has not been justified. Losing sectors and enterprises continue to exist. It seems to us that the power of the price-setting mechanism was overestimated in the operational conditions of individual kolkhozes and sovkhoses at the time of application of differentiated prices. At the same time, the role of organizational-administrative measures and the specific and informal work with each lagging

enterprise and losing sector, aimed at comprehensively increasing the volume of output of agricultural commodities and reducing production costs, was underestimated.

Low production efficiency in one farm or another is, as a rule, the consequence of a number of reasons, including some which cannot be covered or eliminated through prices such as the low initial organizational-technical and economic production standard, which must be enhanced in each individual case through special means, as well as shortcomings in the work of the collectives and their managers and specialists themselves. Therefore, in each lagging farm, based on the recommendations of science and progressive practice, the reasons for low labor productivity must be determined; efforts to surmount losses on a systematic basis must be substantiated. Also awaiting a satisfactory scientific solution are problems relative to setting prices for industrial and agricultural commodities sent to the villages and acceptable from the positions of expanded reproduction in the agrarian sector of the economy. No satisfactory solution of the problem of stabilizing, not to mention lowering, costs and achieving high efficiency indicators in the sector can be satisfactorily resolved without normalizing price ratios between industry and agriculture.

Specific agricultural practices need objective methods for planning and evaluating production activities, based on progressive norms. The current sectorial procedure used in identifying progressive and lagging brigades, enterprises and rayons, based on rating them according to their level of implementation of production plan indicators, does not take into consideration the objective natural-climatic and economic conditions under which the labor collectives work, for which reason it has been justifiably criticized.

The auxiliary plots of rural and urban residents are assigned an important role in the implementation of the Food Program by Siberian oblasts and krais. Here again a number of problems exist, which must be resolved with the help of science. The practical workers are also seeking answers to a number of questions related to the organization of auxiliary farms by industrial enterprises.

Intracost accounting, its most progressive and consistent form above all--the collective contract--presents the Siberian farms with a wide set of problems. Particular confusion exists in labor accounting and wages and the organization of the socialist competition. For decades they have been based on individual piece-rate work, for which reason they no longer objectively meet the requirements of work based on collective labor organization and wage methods.

The efficient utilization of the contracting method is not reduced merely to the organization of subunits. We must also think of training their members, so that they may become true farmers, masters of the land, who know the fine technological points for obtaining high and stable yields, able to make rational use of resources and skillfully to organize the joint work of people and the equipment, rather than being "machine operators." We must find means of relating more closely end labor results to wages, thus protecting the cost-accounting interests of collectives from adverse ways in which the weather could affect the crops. We must put an end to routine planning and

accountability procedures in kolkhozes and sovkhoses, which involve a flood of incoming and outgoing papers and accounts which shunt live work aside. A new look must be taken at the role and work methods of specialists under the circumstances of steadily increasing autonomy and competence of production subunits of kolkhozes and sovkhoses. The collective contract and the consequent dependence of earnings on work results make it necessary to resolve ripe problems in the area of relations among all participants in the production of agricultural commodities both within and outside the individual farms more rapidly and thoroughly.

The time is right to intensify control over the efficiency of the funds allocated for the development of the agroindustrial complex. This requires the accelerated study of problems related to the scientific substantiation of the amount and distribution of capital investments in agriculture and other sectors involved in the production, procurement, storage and processing of agricultural raw materials.

We have listed here a very partial range of problems awaiting a satisfactory scientific and practical solution. However, even this, we believe, gives an idea of the tremendous work which must be done by party, soviet and agricultural authorities, collectives of agricultural enterprises and, naturally, scientific institutions in Siberia. Siberian agronomy faces the full task of formulating the most accurate and concise organizational-economic ways for the solution of all such problems. Unless we do this regional practices will be forced to develop empirically in the future as well and advance through the difficult method of trial and error.

That is why it is so important, without losing any time, to define the methods of organizing scientific activities in the region so that they may face agrarian economic problems and help farming to implement faster and better the assignments listed in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree on the comprehensive development of agriculture in the eastern part of the country and the USSR Food Program.

The VASKHNIL Siberian Department is a large scientific organization with extensive experience in systems planning and organization of comprehensive, including interacademic, studies. With the help of the party, soviet and economic authorities of oblasts, krais and autonomous republics and in accordance with the primary and long-term specific and general agricultural development problems, it is able to formulate current and long-term plans for scientific research in its area.

Naturally, the emphasis on regional problems of theoretical and methodical nature does not exclude the possible participation of Siberian scientific institutions in working on unionwide problems. They can perfectly well act as co-participants and participate in assessing projects completed by other scientific research institutes. However, unquestionably such orders must be financed by the clients.

The most important feature in improving the organization of scientific research is bringing it closer to the production process and its requirements. The practical utilization of major and minor scientific suggestions is the

alpha and omega in the development of public production. Particularly striking in this light is the extremely poor application of already tested recommendations of the science of economics in farming. What makes this even more annoying is that unlike suggestions relative to new technologies or technical facilities which require, as a rule, increased production outlays, the steps developed by science to streamline the organization of production and to improve production relations usually require no additional outlays. This is a guarantee of their high efficiency which is clearly manifested in the growth of overall work indicators in agricultural enterprises.

The reasons for the slow application of such measures are several. Above all, because of weakened cost-accounting incentives the sovkhozes and kolkhozes themselves are not particularly interested in applying innovations which require not material outlays perhaps but additional organizational efforts. The incentive system for the application of scientific developments by the scientific research institutes themselves plays a demobilizing role, for in this case not the fact of its application but merely the proof that an innovation has been approved and recommended is rewarded. However, as one can easily understand, these are different things. We know of a large number of cases in which recommendations drafted by scientists and subsequently approved by the scientific and technical councils of agricultural management authorities remain nothing but a pious wish or, even after they have reached the enterprises, they are filed and forgotten.

Also needing improvements are the activities of the cost accounting subunits for the scientific organization of labor--the so-called scientific organization of labor centers--which were especially set up under the agricultural administrations of oblast or kray executive committees. Currently many of their associates work on the basis of contracts with kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Because of the frequently indifferent attitude of the latter toward the application of economic novelties, as we mentioned, such centers find it difficult to draft their annual work plans. The list of topics is drafted on the basis of random influences and largely depends on the wishes of the farms, the possibilities of the center itself and its ability to find a customer and to convince him of the expediency of the practical utilization of an innovation. As a result, such plans are neither comprehensive nor systematic. They do not pursue a purposeful long-range policy of application of scientific developments in agricultural production.

The tasks involved in upgrading the efficiency of scientific research and bringing it closer to the requirements of agricultural practice and their accelerated practical utilization persistently call for thinking of the future of Siberian agronomy and its development and strengthening. This is one of the mandatory prerequisites for further agricultural progress in the region.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1302/1

SETTING SIGHTS ON THE FUTURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 78-88

[Article by M. Koz'min]

[Text] "Our purpose is to organize literature as a single cultural-revolutionary force." These words expressed by Maksim Gorkiy, heard half a century ago from the rostrum of the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, defines the meaning of its work and all activities of the USSR Union of Writers, the anniversary of which is currently marked by our people.

The bright lights of the Hall of Columns, the crowds of people around the House of the Unions, the depth and scale of Gorkiy's earth-shattering report, and the passionate speeches by writers and guests, of captivating sincerity and purposefulness, all blended within the solemn picture and everything indicated that a great event was taking place in the country's cultural and sociopolitical life. Indeed, the First Writers' Congress became a real triumph of Leninist cultural policy and the Leninist principle of party-mindedness of literature.

Not even 30 years had passed since, in his famous article "Party Organization and Party Literature," V. I. Lenin foresaw the appearance of a truly free literature, openly related to the proletariat. "This will be a free literature," he wrote, "for not self-interest or careerism but the ideas of socialism and compassion for the working people will recruit ever new forces within its ranks. It will be a free literature for it will not serve a sated heroine or bored and overfed 'upper 10,000' but millions and tens of millions of working people, who are the flower of the country, its strength and its future. This will be a free literature which will fructify the latest word of the revolutionary thinking of mankind with the experience and live work of the socialist proletariat, creating a constant interaction between the experience of the past (scientific socialism and the completed development of socialism beyond its primitive utopian forms) and the experience of the future (the true struggle waged by comrade workers)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 12, p 1044).

Such a literature indeed appeared. Born of the Great October Socialist Revolution, at the First Congress of Soviet Writers it definitively became the last word in global artistic developments, a certain socioesthetic unity and

part of the all-proletarian cause--the great cause of the reorganization of life on a socialist and communist basis.

The unification of the writers' forces of our homeland was an imperative of the time itself, the imperative of the unforgettable years of the great change, when industrialization, collectivization and the cultural revolution had solved once and for all the problem of laying the foundations of socialism in our country. A new historical community--the Soviet people--began to be formed by workers, peasants and the toiling intelligentsia, following the elimination of the exploiting classes. This triggered most profound changes in the minds of millions of people, marking the triumph of the ideology of the working class, which was becoming the ideology of the entire Soviet society. The happy feeling that new relations unparalleled in history, relations of friendship and cooperation for the sake of the implementation of a lofty and noble objective were developing, was imbuing the entire social atmosphere by the turn of the 1930s. This was increasingly emphasized by Gorkiy in his publicistic articles and talks with writers and journalists. "A new tie is being created among the peasants, who had involved in kolkhozes their fellow villagers, the workers, who had mastered the technology of complex machine tools, the economic managers, who had organized the new type of production and scientists who had drafted a gigantic plan for the economic reorganization of krays and oblasts...", he told the editorial workers of the journal NASHI DOSTIZHENIYA. He explained that "this is a new social and labor tie.... It creates a new perception of the world. It is the foundation of new attitudes toward labor, society and the people around us."

Naturally, the process of establishment of new social relations involved the entire mass of the labor intelligentsia. Various capitulationist predictions notwithstanding, socialism won in the country. Life followed the path indicated by Lenin. This became clear also to those strata of the intelligentsia which had initially assumed the position of skeptical or sympathetic observers, in an effort to preserve the illusion that they were above classes and parties. By the turn of the 1930s, the intelligentsia, the artistic intelligentsia in particular, had decisively turned itself toward the Soviet system and actively joined in the building of socialism.

At that time our literature made a powerful leap toward reality, the life of the people and the new socialist features. However, its division into circles and groups which warred with each other was a major obstacle on the way to its further development as a single socioesthetic force and prevented it to concentrate on the main thing: identifying and truthfully depicting socialist changes. This was felt most sharply by the writers themselves. Many of them began to leave the groups in which they sometimes held leading positions. Thus, P. Pavlenko, M. Prishvin and A. Karavayev left Pereval. V. Lugovskiy and K. Zelinskiy, its main theoreticians, left the structuralist group. V. Mayakovskiy left the LEF [Art's Left Front] for the RAPP [Russian Association of Proletarian Writers], for the sake of "implementing the consolidation slogan."

Indeed, at that time the RAPP was the most prestigious and largest writer's organization. It played a major role in rallying the forces of proletarian literature and defending it from the capitulationists, who were rejecting the

possibility itself of the creation and existence of such literature. At the beginning of the 1930s, the policy of the RAPP began clearly to fall behind tempestuously developing life and, furthermore, to clash with it. The pitting of proletarian writers against "fellow travelers" and party against nonparty writers was losing its meaning in circumstances governed by the shaping and strengthening of the moral-political unity of our society. Ignoring such changes in the consciousness and feelings of the broad circles of literary workers, who had become imbued with the general enthusiasm of building socialism, the RAPP formulated vulgarizing and political erroneous slogans such as "No Fellow Traveler But Ally or Enemy" and "The Shock Worker Is the Central Figure in Literature," which could only alienate a significant number of writers from the working class and the party. This triggered a sharp discontent among literary workers. Increasingly the idea of the unification of writers' forces dominated the writers' minds. It was firmly supported and developed by Gorkiy. As early as September 1930, in a letter to the then State Publishing House Manager A. B. Khalatov he described circles as "a calamity on the literary front" and expressed the idea that the party and the Central Committee should "take steps to terminate such unnecessary and harmful noise." "...The 'enemies' should be gathered under the same roof," Gorkiy suggested, "and persuaded of the need for strict unity." Back in Moscow from Sorrento, in May 1931, he immediately gathered the RAPP membership and the "fellow travelers" under his own roof and, after hearing out their reciprocal accusations, called for the creation of a great progressive literature through joint efforts, a literature which would serve the people and help to build socialism. "It was a question of unifying all literary groups within a single Soviet Writers' Union," Lev Nikulin explained, in concluding his story of this talk between Gor'kiy and the writers.

Indeed, less than a year later the VKP(b) Central Committee passed the decree "On the Restructuring of Literary-Artistic Organization," according to which associations of proletarian writers were abolished and all writers who supported the platform of the Soviet system and wanted to participate in building socialism were rallied within a single union of Soviet writers, with a communist faction within it.

The Central Committee decree was welcomed by the majority of writers as an expression of their own wishes, aspirations and expectations. It was consistent with the actual state of affairs in literature and its further development tasks. Gorkiy highly rated the Central Committee decree, pointing out that it opened new opportunities for the powerful growth of our young literature. Once again writers gathered in his home to discuss the initial organizational measures for preparations for the congress--the creation of an organizational committee and its program.

Speaking of the fact that the unification of Soviet writers within a single creative organization had become ripe and could not fail to take place, we must acknowledge that this striking scope of organizational steps and the depth of development of the creative platform of the future union, which characterized both the preparations for and the congress itself, were related above all to Gorkiy's personality, his worldwide reputation, encyclopedic knowledge and truly fantastic organizational energy--an energy inspired by the ideas of the socialist reorganization of life. Gorkiy was the central figure

in Soviet literature around which it rallied, a writer who had greater foresight and breadth of vision than anyone else. That is why the party and the writers entrusted him with the preparations for and holding of the congress. That is also why a meeting between writers and heads of the party and government took place in his home in October 1932.

This meeting was of great importance in the preparations for the congress. It was precisely at that time that the organizational committee intended to hold its first plenum, i.e., to take a first step toward the practical unification of the writers, and was beginning to formulate the organizational and creative platform of the future association. Further work on preparations for the congress depended on the nature of this first step. Not all writers had as yet become aware of the meaning of events and the need for a decisive change in literature in connection with the Central Committee decree. Under those circumstances an open and frank discussion on the needs of the writers and their doubts and expectations could contribute a great deal. Indeed, it dealt with problems of the greatest importance in the development of our literature. It was a question of the errors of the RAPP, the role of the writers as "engineers of the human soul," the world outlook and method of socialist realism, the importance of theater and playwriting and the attitude toward cultural legacy. The main question, however, was that of establishing proper relations between writers who were or were not party members.

In explaining the party line on this matter, J. V. Stalin emphasized that the party's strength lies in the support of the broadest possible nonparty masses. The thoughts expressed at that meeting are described as follows in K. Zelinskiy's recollections: Lenin always said that the crux of the matter is for the party members to be able to lead the nonparty members. What does it mean for a nonparty member who wishes to work alongside us for the victory of socialism? It means that he is still lacking something. What that is, he still does not know. Therefore, it should be explained to him. Party members are few and nonparty members are far more numerous. What would happen if the mass of nonparty workers would not follow the party? Therefore, one must be able to develop an influence and to lead. To rebuff a sympathizer--not an enemy, for this was not a point of discussion--but to rebuff a sympathizer is easy whereas to earn his trust is hard. "Generating fear" and alienating people is easy but drawing them over to one's side is difficult.

Why did we abolish the RAPP? the discussion continued. Precisely because the RAPP had become alienated from the nonparty people and had stopped doing the party's work in literature. All the RAPP could do was to "generate fear." But "generating fear" is not enough. One must "generate trust." That is what one must do. That is why the decision was made to eliminate all kinds of groupings in literature. Grouping created an unhealthy situation which did not encourage trust. We disbanded all groups and eliminated the largest--the RAPP--which was responsible for such groupings. Now the party will demand of all party literary workers to implement this policy.... We must take the nonparty writers into consideration. They may not be party members but they know life and how to describe it. They too are promoting our cause. There are many more writers than one may think. We shall be joined by thousands and tens of thousands of new writers among the young people who have become literate.... One must be able to work with them. Such is the task of our

future Writers' Union. It must provide conditions for the work of every writer in the country, who supports the platform of the Soviet system and sympathizes with the building of communism (USSR Academy of Sciences IMLI [Institute of World Literature]. A. M. Gorkiy Archive).

The new relations between party and nonparty members were the moral-political foundation on which the Soviet Writers' Union began to be structured. The idea not only of an organizational association but of creative unity became one of the fundamental thoughts in the preparations for and holding of the congress. It reflected the spirit of socialist collectivism, which imbued spiritual life at that time and which powerfully penetrated the world outlook and creativity of the writers.

Starting with the first organizational committee plenum, the idea of unity became increasingly broad, rich and comprehensive. The plenum detected, as Gorkiy said, "a readiness to work like friends." This readiness was voiced in the speeches of both party and nonparty artists. "We must be a single union, a single person, a single spirit and be pleased with one another's successes," M. Prishvin said, concluding that "this is perfectly in step with present socialism." Andrey Belyy expressed the same idea. "Our knowledge of one another," he said, "leads to our joint awareness that all this work is socialist."

It was such feelings of "shared joy" and "shared awareness" which determined the moral and ideological atmosphere of those pre-congress times, when the foundations were being laid for a single creative union of writers. One is amazed at what a great deal was accomplished during that time. The organizational committee worked intensively in resolving not only organizational but creative and theoretical problems. On Gorkiy's initiative brigades of writers were set up to study the condition of the literatures of fraternal republics, to develop problems of socialist realism and to work with young literary workers. Conferences were held on the current condition of essays, poetry, playwriting, folk creativity and cooperation between writers and scientists. Discussions developed on the language and the method of socialist realism. Writers' brigades visited republics and construction projects. New journals and collective works were published and new publishing houses such as Sovetskiy Pisatel' and Detgiz, were opened. Tremendous preparatory work was under way throughout the country--in republics, krais, oblasts and cities.

Let us point out again that our literature was indeed lucky that at such important, crucial times it was guided by Gorkiy and that it was precisely he who set the scale of the discussion at the congress by developing in his speech the philosophical-aesthetic concept of the development of human culture and pointing out the role which Soviet literature was to play as the most progressive, the most revolutionary literature in the world. Both delegates and guests of the congress adopted and maintained this lofty level of discussion and its sincerity and thoughtfulness. Some 200 people addressed the congress. This was an unparalleled upsurge of writers' thinking, which illuminated like a powerful beacon the complex and occasionally not entirely clear problems of literary work.

The congress's entire proceedings were imbued with the awareness that in interpreting the contemporary condition of Soviet literature it was earmarking its future development, that it was turned toward the future. Indeed, the congress left us such wealth of creative thought, recognizing the meaning and techniques of literary work that to this day we can draw from this source in resolving problems which arise. In discussing the role which the congress has played in the history of our literature, Mustay Karim, the Tatar writer, quite aptly characterized it with the statement that it belongs to the type of "prime phenomena, the significance of which is multiplied by time."

Time has multiplied, broadened and deepened the most important ideas and principles formulated at the congress. First among them is the idea of the unity of our literature, which became the foundation of the Soviet Writers' Union and the linchpin of its activities. This idea was brought to light extensively and comprehensively at the very first congress, as a unity of writers, unity between writers and the party and the people, unity of national literatures which form the all-union Soviet literature and, finally, unity of objective and artistic method. "The Writers' Union," Gorkiy said at the congress, "is being established not only for the sake of physically uniting the masters of prose but also so that a professional union would enable them to understand their collective force and determine with possible clarity the variety of creative trends and purposes and harmoniously to combine all objectives within the type of unity which guides the country's entire creative energy."

The unification of the writers in a creative association of like-thinking people was one of the most important victories of socialism in the area of culture. By skillfully guiding such processes, the party awakened in the broad writers' circles an awareness of their responsibility for all Soviet literature and of their collective strength. A new type of writer began to take shape: an active participant in socialist changes, a writer inspired by the ideal of communism. Gorkiy described this writer in a letter to members of the literary circle in the vocational technical school in Pokrovsk, outlining his major characteristics: hatred of anything which oppresses man from outside and within, respect for man as the source of creative energy, presenting the poetry of collective toil, the purpose of which is to create new forms of life, a consideration of women as loyal comrades and assistants in the difficult matter of living, the attitude toward children to whom we are responsible for everything we do and, finally, the aspiration comprehensively to enhance the active attitude of the readers toward life. The education of a writer of this type, of a writer-citizen and fighter, is the most important accomplishment of the Writers' Union. The communist convictions and social activeness of Soviet writers highly enhanced the moral and political prestige of our literature and defined its role in the country's ideological life.

One of the fruitful manifestations of collectivism in literary work today is the joint work by writers on books dealing with the most important social processes of our time, such as the series "Biography of Communist Construction Projects" and "The Writer and His Time," and the anthologies "Rukopozhat'ye" [Handshake], "Tovarishch Moskva" [Comrade Moscow] and "Tyumenskaya Doroga" [Tyumen Trail]. Such work is a continuation and development of Gorkiy's outstanding initiatives. Collective trips by literary workers abroad are

country, study of people's construction projects and sponsoring Soviet literature days and creative conferences have assumed unparalleled scope. Without belittling in the least the significance of individual creativity, the fruitfulness of such collective forms of writing should be acknowledged. We must again and again think of Gorkiy's words to the effect that it is precisely the collective labor method which helps us to understand the nature of socialist realism. Collective knowledge of tempestuously developing life, wrote G. M. Markov, first secretary of the Board of the Soviet Writers' Union, ensures a "stereotypic view of reality, for the collective assessment of what has been seen develops in the course of collective contacts with this reality."

The First Congress of Soviet Writers proved clearly and convincingly that unity with party and people is the base for the unification of writers and that the most important principles of our literature are party-mindedness and nationality. In summing up the results of the congress, Gorkiy emphasized that both party and nonparty literary workers have acknowledged bolshevism as "the only militant leading idea in creative work, in the art of the word."

The idea of bolshevik party-mindedness was comprehensively and profoundly substantiated in the speech with which A. A. Zhdanov, VKP(b) Central Committee secretary, opened the congress. In highly assessing the achievements of Soviet literature, the party pointed out that its strength lies in communist idea-mindedness, close ties with the life of the working people, active participation in socialist construction, proletarian humanism and steady advancement, in which its method, the method of socialist realism, was based. It clashed against the decline and decay of bourgeois culture with all of these qualities as the most idea-minded, the most progressive and most revolutionary literature in the world.

The words of the party, the words of great trust and great exigency, addressed to the writers attending their first congress, met with a lively response in their speeches which were imbued with infinite faith in the cause of the party and the science of communism. "The Soviet writers are inseparably linked to the party, the bearer and safekeeper of our best hopes and knowledge," communist writer V. Bakhmet'yev said. "This tie brings us joy. It is as joyful and necessary as the air is to a living organism, as the blood is to our muscles and as the brain is in our difficult toil." L. Sobolev's speech was imbued with a feeling of sincere gratitude to the party, who teaches the literary workers the ability to see, feel and depict accurately. Playwright B. Romashov, stating that the social atmosphere created by the party triggers in the artist a "special feeling of closeness of interests and immediacy of the desired objective, joy in labor, simplicity and depth in human relations and the reality of tomorrow today...", called upon the writers to breathe deeply the air of our country, saturated with the spirit of the century. Critic I. Lezhnev described in his speech the complex and sometimes hard road of the intelligentsia leading it to the party. Vs. Ivanov and L. Seyfullina spoke of the bolshevik tendentiousness in the works of nonparty writers and their responsibility for literature, alongside the communists. The story of Yu. Olesha on how the world became real and just to him by learning the humaneness of socialism sounded like a profoundly sincere and creative confession. In his speech, poet V. Lugovskiy described his path as one from

the world of loneliness and despair to the world of those who protect, struggle and enjoy. He concluded with the admission that "party-mindedness in poetry, in human lyricism can only multiply the strength and possibilities of the poet."

It was perhaps precisely at their first congress that the Soviet writers felt with unparalleled strength and clarity their inseparable ties with the people. The Soviet people reacted to the congress as to a major event in social life. About 15,000 requests for guest tickets were submitted to the organizational committee. More than 30 guests spoke at the congress. They were the envoys of plants, mines, kolkhozes, military units, seamen, railroad workers, subway builders and students. The writers were greeted by representatives of the other detachments of the Soviet intelligentsia--scientists, painters, composers and theater workers. It can be said that the congress became a unionwide encounter between our literature and the reading public. Soon after the event, Gorkiy reminded the writers that at the congress, the proletariat, as the reader and friend, "loudly proclaimed to the entire world its high assessment of literature, its love for it and the hope that the literary workers will give it good and honest books, while the literary workers unanimously answered with their readiness to work 'in contact' with it, in accordance with its revolutionary activities and...the truth of hundreds of millions of people, who are gradually becoming aware of their rights to be the masters of their lives." It was at that meeting and in contact with the most progressive and revolutionary class of the Soviet people that the national nature of Soviet literature was manifested.

The concept of nationality is many-sided. It includes a tie with folk creativity, the accessibility of literature to the people, a reflection of folk daily life and character and, finally, the recreation of the leading trends of reality from the viewpoint of the people, i.e., the social strata which act as the motive force of history and whose ideas, thoughts and aspirations express the progressive ideas of the epoch. In a period of widespread vulgar-sociological views on art, the concept of a class-oriented literature appeared to reject, to eliminate the concept of its national character. The unquestionable merit of the congress was the elimination of this erroneous confrontation and the assertion of the principle of nationality as one of the most important ones in literature in general and Soviet literature in particular.

"Art belongs to the people." This Leninist thought was heard in a number of addresses, above all in Gorkiy's speech. He brought to light with striking depth and persuasiveness the popular origins and base of artistic creativity. Unity of thought and feelings, labor and thinking, optimism, awareness of the immortality of collectivism and confidence in its victory over all forces hostile to it are all qualities inherent in folk creativity, lost in feudal and bourgeois literature but continuing to feed the creativity of classics and, in Gorkiy's views, destined to gain a new development in socialist art.

Gorkiy's idea of the unbreakable ties between literature and the creativity of the people--the creators of all cultural values--met with a lively response among the delegates. "Increasingly art is beginning to find...its roots in the popular mass." Critic V. Yermilov backed this claim with facts proving

the measure of the creative forces of the people and the tremendous growth of the "national-revolutionary" genre, and the awareness of the new generation of Soviet writers of their direct ties with the people. The concept of "nationality" was also mentioned in his speech as an ideological-artistic criterion. It was precisely in nationality that he saw the "true value of an outstanding work of Soviet literature such as 'Virgin Land Upturned'."

At the congress, the writers' unity was also revealed as a unity of literatures of the Soviet Union. Here again it was Gorkiy who set the tone by stating in his speech that Soviet literature is an all-union literature and that "the only thing that distinguishes us from the literary workers in our fraternal republics is language, for they live and work under the light and beneficial influence of the same ideas which today unite the entire world of working people splintered by capitalism."

One could say that the first congress was a congress of acquaintanceship. The literatures of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and the Tatar Autonomous Republic were described in the special reports to the delegates. The reporters tried to provide an idea of the values created by these literatures. They provided brief reviews of their historical developments and characterized their contemporary progress and problems. Armenian poet Ye. Charents characterized this as one of the most important positive results of the congress, which brought to light the very rich literary treasures created by the peoples of the land of the soviets, the poet said, proving that even "'small nations' already have today all the necessary opportunities to create a culture national in its form...and to participate in the great cause of building socialism." Our congress, K. Fedin said, "is not only a congress of Soviet writers but a congress of Soviet nationalities.... We are witnessing a demonstration of friendship and ideological unity of nationalities..."

Actually, this was the first time that such a broad panoramic view of the development of the national literatures in the Soviet Union was presented to the writers. The meaning of this unionwide meeting of literatures, however, went beyond reciprocal acquaintanceships. It also consisted of recognizing Soviet literature as a multinational entity. "Different in languages but not in voices" was the way Academician I. Luppol described it briefly. The discussion covered not only the artistic wealth of the literatures of the Soviet Union but their unity as well. In particular, this was discussed by Gladkov, who pointed out that "the literature of the peoples of the USSR is a single movement of Soviet art," and that "all the creative achievements of the individual republics are...our common accomplishment...." M. Shaginyan expressed an important thought relevant to this day. By being closely in touch with the art of our republics at the congress, she said, we gained new opportunities for resolving our creative and theoretical problems. "A time has come in the history of the development of our art when we can no longer generalize on the narrow field of the literature of a single nationality, leading though it may be, but must generalize on the broadened foundation of the comparative study of numerous socialist literatures."

The fruitfulness of this thought and of the entire writers' discussion of the variety and unity of Soviet literature is confirmed today after 50 years of

development. It is confirmed by the blossoming of national literatures and the strengthening of their unity. Our ideological opponents are still trying to prove that the unity of literatures of the Soviet people eliminated their national features and led to their standardization. The facts prove the opposite. The 50 years which separate us from the congress marked the birth of new literatures. Whereas 40 national literatures were represented at the congress, today Soviet literature is created in 78 languages. Many works by writers of fraternal nations have gained unionwide and world fame. At the same time, contemporary Soviet literature is by no means a conglomerate of individual literatures. It has acquired an integrity as an international ideological-artistic entity on the grounds of mature socialism. It is truly international both in terms of the multiple nationalities represented and its universal socialist aspiration, inherent in the ideology of the most progressive social class--the working class. This trend of development of Soviet literature toward international unity was realized collectively by the writers at their very first congress. This was the path along which they have been guided by the communist party.

One of the principles which unified Soviet literature is its method. The history of the origins of the term "socialist realism" has been quite extensively interpreted in a number of works and recollections of the participants in the formulation of this definition. All of them convincingly prove that the fabrications of bourgeois "Sovietologists" notwithstanding, the method of socialist realism was not imposed on Soviet literature from somewhere at the top and that this definition was the theoretical summation of the live practice of socialist literature and that the term itself was formulated in the course of the collective discussions which were held between the special commission of the VKP(b) Central Committee and writers and critics. It was also then, on 20 May 1932, that it was made public in the speech delivered by I. Gronskiy, the then-organizational committee chairman, at a meeting of the aktiv of Moscow literary circles. "Our main requirement for the writers," he said, "is to write the truth, to depict our reality, which itself is dialectical, truthfully. Therefore, the method of socialist realism is the basic method in Soviet literature."

The development of the concept itself was undertaken after the new method was defined. It was discussed at the organizational committee plenums. The discussion developed into a wide debate in the press, with the participation of dozens and hundreds of Soviet writers and critics. Most actively participating were foreign writers such as Romain Rolland, M. Andersen, and others. Some 400 articles written in the Russian language alone were published in the course of 1.5 years. After summing up the results of the debate, the organizational committee formulated the concept of socialist realism in the draft bylaws of the USSR Union of Soviet Writers, which were published in the 6 May 1934 PRAVDA issue. With minor corrections, this formulation was adopted at the First Congress of Soviet writers.

"Socialist realism, as the basic method of Soviet artistic literature and literary criticism," the bylaws read, "demands of the artist the truthful, historically concrete presentation of reality in its revolutionary development. Truthfulness and historical concreteness of the artistic

depiction of reality must be combined with the task of the ideological remaking and raising of the working people in the spirit of socialism.

"Socialist realism offers artistic creativity an exceptional opportunity for the manifestation of creative initiative and the choice of a variety of forms, styles and genres."

This definition of socialist realism has withstood the test of time and remains relevant to this day for, having gathered within it the experience of Soviet literature, it also properly tapped and expressed the most important distinguishing features of its main direction, the trend along which our literature developed and is continuing to develop and which brings it to the proscenium of world literature.

The theory of socialist realism has moved far ahead in the 50 years since the First Writers' Congress. It has become enriched with the experience not only of Soviet literature but the literatures of the socialist countries and all worldwide progressive literature. It has been enriched by the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and aesthetic thinking. However, the "discovery" of socialist realism and the first steps which were taken to interpret it as a new method of artistic creativity and a new trend in world art are always linked in our minds to the first writers' forum. In the course of the pre-congress discussions and at the congress itself a number of thoughts were expressed which draw our attention to this day and deserve to be developed further. Particularly great in this case were the contributions of A. M. Gorkiy and A. V. Lunacharskiy. In their profound and comprehensive interpretation of the concept of artistic truth, the writer and the critic comprehensively emphasized the dynamism of socialist realism, its thrust toward the future and its aspiration to penetrate reality and directly to participate in its socialist transformation.

Both Gorkiy and Lunacharskiy proceeded in their concept of socialist realism from the Leninist theory of reflection and the Marxist-Leninist concept of the activeness of the human consciousness. Frequently referring to Marx's famous thesis according to which "philosophers have merely explained the world in various ways although the question was to change it," the writer said that the method used by Soviet literature should be determined by this task and be based on the scientific understanding of reality as development and forward movement. "I believe that the starting point of socialist realism should be Engels' assertion that life is a steady motion and change," Gorkiy wrote to A. S. Shcherbakov.

Ensuring the possibility of a truthful depiction of life as a motion and development can be achieved only with a clear and scientifically substantiated idea of its direction and objective, an idea which is provided by the Marxist-Leninist theory of society. Naturally, Gorkiy combines the concept of objective and truth. "What type of truth do we need?" he asks. He answers: "The truth which faces us as an objective." Elsewhere, discussing the lofty objective set by the proletariat for itself, Gorkiy claims that "this objective is precisely the greatest, the brightest truth of which the working people the world over have dreamed for centuries..." drawing the attention of one of his correspondents to Lenin's rare ability to look at the present with

the eyes of the future," the writer points out that, in his view, "it is precisely this height, this ability that must become the foundation of the type of 'socialist realism' which we are beginning to describe as something new and necessary in our literature." In his article "On Socialist Realism" he repeated that "this lofty viewpoint must and will trigger the proud, the happy enthusiasm which will set a new tone for our literature and will help it to create new forms and the new development we need--socialist realism..."

Lunacharskiy developed similar ideas in his report at the second organizational committee plenum. He asserted that socialist realism means above all being loyal to reality but immediately emphasized that we acknowledge reality as an arena of our activities and that "our realism is profoundly dynamic." "The socialist realist," he went on to say, "understands reality as development, as motion, as a tireless struggle between opposites." Like Gorkiy, Lunacharskiy considered that the truth of the artist must face the future. "A person who does not understand development," he said with conviction, "will never see the truth, for the truth...does not stand still. The truth has wings. Truth means development, conflict and struggle. Truth means the future and that is precisely the way it should be considered...."

Both Gorkiy and Lunacharskiy tried to find new forms and artistic means related to the active nature of the literature of socialist realism. Gorkiy expressed his profound conviction of the right of the writer to engage in conjectures and to exaggerate. "...The figurative thinking of the artist, based on the extensive knowledge of reality and supplemented by the intuitive aspiration to present the material in its most perfect form, adding to something that is possible and desirable," he said, "can also 'anticipate,' i.e., in other words the art of socialist realism has the right to exaggerate--to 'conjecture'." To Gorkiy the "conjecturing" of a person meant to emphasize those of his qualities which belong to the future as well as those which belong to the past. "It is particularly important to depict as bigger and brighter and life a character who creates a socialist culture, the writer said. "This is not only a requirement of life but of socialist realism, which must think hypothetically. The hypothesis, in turn, is the twin sister of the hyperbole--the exaggeration...." It was no accident that Gorkiy and Lunacharskiy paid great attention to the romantic principle inherent in socialist realism, which was also mentioned by a number of other congress delegates. Revolutionary romanticism was consistent with the spirit of the time, the optimistic view of a tempestuously developing reality and the heroics of the building of socialism and striving toward the future.

The ability of the writer not only to see but to predict was made clear at the congress in the speeches of a number of literary workers. A. Surkov prophetically said that "let us not forget that the time is near when poems will move from the pages of big journals to the pages of front-line newspapers and army division field newspapers." This was 7 years before the outbreak of the mortal clash with fascism. In anticipating the terrible events and speaking of proletarian humanism, the poet suggested that it include hatred for the enemy. L. Leonov anticipated the course of history to an even greater extent. "Under our own eyes," he said, "more new Soviet republics will be established and the self awareness of colonial countries will be awakened thunderously. Ever more advanced forms of human community life will be

created..., we shall participate in world congresses of socialist literature.... The present agenda includes not only problems relative to the birth of the new man but problems of the powerful struggle against the elements and the increasing activities of man in space."

The range of problems discussed at the First Soviet Writers' Congress was truly infinite. The fundamental features of socialist realism as a new direction in world literature, a direction conflicting with bourgeois modernism, were defined in Gorkiy's speeches and in the speeches of the delegates. They discussed new topics, new characters and new enthusiasms--the enthusiasms of assertiveness--the new readers and the new types of writers. Gorkiy's understanding of socialist realism was condensed in his famous formulation that "socialist realism," he said, "asserts life as an action, as a creativity the purpose of which is the continuing development of the most valuable individual capabilities of man for the sake of defeating the forces of nature, for the sake of man's health and longevity and the great happiness of living on earth, which, in accordance with the steady growth of his needs, he would like to turn into a beautiful house for mankind, united within a single family." These inspired words expressed the truly humanistic nature of the new trend in literature and its socialist ideal.

Problems of artistic skill, language and form also held the center of attention of the congress. This was a saturated and impassioned discussion of professional problems which occasionally developed into a debate. This was a collective search by the writers of new means of artistic expression, a search for new ways of intensifying the social significance of literary creativity. In the course of the discussion of all of these problems socialist realism became apparent in both its unity and variety, in the variety of styles and creative individualities and forms of artistic reproduction of reality, not only lifelike but also conventional and imaginary. Here again we should point out that these methods and means were not borrowed from the modernistic arsenal but were developed by Soviet literature itself, which continued and developed the great realistic traditions of the past.

By demonstrating the ideological and creative unity of Soviet literature and the loftiness and nobility of its ideal and inseparable ties with the life of the people, the First Soviet Writers' Congress had a great impact on world literature. This was confirmed in the greetings addressed to the congress by some of the greatest foreign writers. "I send you my fraternal greetings!" Romain Rolland wrote. "We shall struggle for freedom, for a proletarian culture, for peace, and we shall win!" Rafael Alberti, who addressed the congress on behalf of the Spanish Association of Revolutionary Writers and Painters, said to the Soviet literary workers that "...your profound mastery of socialism is a high example which triggers the admiration of writers the world over." The noted Danish writer Martin Andersen-Nexø said: "Here, we draw strength from you.... You are the leading detachment. You are the vanguard of mankind."

Fifty years ago the First Soviet Writers' Congress defined the task of Soviet literature--the task of increasing closeness to the life of the people, a path of active participation in building socialism and communism and in molding the socialist individual. This was the path which our party has indicated and is

indicating to the writers. It was along this path that we achieved major victories. It was along this path that the artistic phenomenon which we proudly describe today as Soviet classics was established. It was along this path that our art gained universal recognition and prestige. In promoting peace, social progress and the lofty ideals of socialism and humanism, our literature is gaining increasing support among the progressive writers the world over.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/1

MAJOR STAGE OF THE ETHIOPIAN REVOLUTION

AU231200 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84)
pp 89-98

[Article by Haile Mariam Mengistu, chairman of the Commission for the Organization of the Workers Party of Ethiopia and of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia]

[Text] The same basic laws that are characteristic of the struggle for the social liberation of workers in general are also inherent in the Ethiopian revolution. Its specific distinctive features are a result of the fact that these basic laws are being implemented in forms that take into account the concrete conditions of our country.

As is known, the rise and development of scientific socialism are connected with the existence of capitalism and of the workers class and socialism itself is--according to the teaching of historical materialism--a result of the liquidation of capitalism. Nevertheless, this general truth does not at all imply that every society must obligatorily pass through the stage of capitalist development before it makes its transition to socialism. It is possible to enter the next stage by passing over the capitalist stage.

According to the Marxist-Leninist theory which has been confirmed in practice during the past decades of our century, the backward societies in which feudal production relations are dominant and in which social relations have not reached a high level, can achieve their transition to socialism under certain conditions. The main prerequisite for this possibility is the favorable situation created by the victory of socialism after the Great October Socialist Revolution, first in one country and then the subsequent transformation of socialism into a world system.

The transformations and the progress achieved by the Ethiopian revolution in all spheres during one decade once again convincingly attest to the correctness of the revolutionary theory that indicates the possibility for building socialism as a result of development along a noncapitalist way.

Throughout their entire history, the Ethiopian people have waged a prolonged struggle against foreign invaders and colonizers to defend the frontiers of their motherland and their independence and sovereignty. Nevertheless, under the conditions of a feudal system and incipient capitalism in the country, the people were subject to plunder and oppression. The national independence for

which the people shed their blood through centuries was illusory because the country was actually dependent on imperialism and neocolonialism.

The economy of prerevolutionary Ethiopia--with the exception of a number of districts where some consumer goods were produced--was characterized by the natural methods of economic operations and the predominance of backward handicraft production in industry. The few existing production and marketing enterprises and financial institutions were controlled by foreign capital. The low level of social development was determined by the fact that more than 93 percent of the population were illiterate, that an extremely difficult situation existed in all spheres of social security and that the occurrence of social ills was limitless. A policy of dividing the people by their tribal affiliations and by their national, religious and other characteristics was followed in the political sphere to prevent them from uniting in the struggle for their rights. It should be added to this that the people were not given any opportunity whatsoever to participate in the administration of the state and the economy.

These then were the objective causes which pushed Ethiopia's working people, who not only aspired to find a way out of this horrible situation but also in general to put an end to backwardness, along the road of uprising and, what is more, prompted them to choose the socialist road of development.

The international situation existing at the time was of great importance for the successful advance of our revolution. On one hand, at the time our revolution flared up, international imperialism, especially U. S. imperialism, was in the grips of a deep crisis; and on the other, under the conditions of the realization of the policy of detente, the forces working for peace, democracy and social progress were scoring one victory after another.

It was precisely in the course of the revolution that Ethiopia's broad popular masses gained the necessary experience of political struggle, but when the revolution began in February 1974 we had in our country no vanguard political organization which would be able to lead the revolution. The future fate of the revolution was doubtful in view of a widening and spreading popular uprising and in the absence of a centralized leadership. In this situation, it was the soldiers with deep roots among the people who assumed the coordinating role. The formation of the Coordination Committee of the Armed Forces, Police and Territorial Army, which included democratically elected representatives of the military personnel of various units and detachments, was of decisive importance for ensuring that the revolution did not perish in its infancy. At the moment when it became necessary to assume political power in order to ensure the successful development of the revolution, the Coordination Committee, which possessed all the necessary qualities for this purpose and represented an organized armed force united by firm discipline, succeeded in defeating the hidden enemies of the revolution. The provisional military government formed on this basis successfully solved the problem of key importance for the further development of the revolution, the problem of state authority.

The Provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC) did not come to power as a result of some kind of a coup carried out by a handful of conspirators,

but as a result of the participation of the broad popular masses in the struggle and by their will, a majority of Ethiopian soldiers who had known the hard fate under the conditions of the feudal system with the broad popular masses made an important contribution to the cause of revolution and, through their representatives, performed a coordinating role in the early period when the uprising of the popular masses lacked a single united center. In this respect it is the most important measures such as the nationalization of land, of large production and marketing enterprises, and of urban land plots and lucrative housing and the drafting and implementation of the program of the National Democratic Revolution that represent concrete evidence of the enormous revolutionary work accomplished by the Provisional Military Administrative Council. Firmly striving to fulfill the aspirations of the popular masses, the Provisional Military Administrative Council has continued to work tirelessly for the formation of a vanguard leading political organization of the working people, something that also has its due place in the history of our revolution.

One of the first steps in this sphere was to provide the country with a large quantity of Marxist-Leninist literature, because the dissemination of a scientific ideology is the basic prerequisite for the formation of a leading party. At the same time, serious efforts were made to legalize the activity of the political organizations of the persons and groups which were active on the side of the revolution. The Marxist-Leninist groups formed in this situation made their contribution to the revolution's development during its initial stage.

Despite the fact that in that period the Ethiopian revolution lacked a vanguard party leadership, the Provisional Military Administrative Council and all true revolutionaries of Ethiopia were aware of the fact that such a leadership was necessary for the final victory and that there was no alternative to it.

Naturally, sharp ideological differences arose in the struggle for the formation of a party that would be capable of exercising complete leadership of the revolution; and, what is more, that struggle also required considerable sacrifices. The process of the formation of a vanguard party which would provide firm leadership for the new people's political system took place in a society in which the feudal way of thinking was still dominant and to which even bourgeois political views were alien. This is why, for objective reasons, this process passed through numerous ups and downs.

The program of the Ethiopian National Democratic Revolution which was proclaimed by the provisional Military Administrative Council in April 1974 clearly presented to friends and foes alike the goals and ways of the further development of our revolution and has a special place in the history of this revolution. This fundamental document listed the measures which were planned in all spheres to ensure equality, freedom, justice and welfare for Ethiopia's working masses and also clearly stated that the formation of a new political system was a question of primary importance for the fulfillment of all these tasks. To ensure a broader democratic participation of the popular masses in making the transition to socialism as well as to ensure that the people win power and become true masters of the fruits of their victory, the program

devoted special attention to the formation of the Ethiopian People's Democratic Republic and of a party of the working people which would play the vanguard role.

The proclamation of this program not only provided the revolution with the basic directives for the tasks of protecting, expanding and deepening its achievements in all spheres but also created more favorable conditions than had ever existed before to unify the efforts that had been uncoordinated until then but which were aimed at forming a vanguard party.

In that situation when there was no single organized force that would be able to unite the broad popular masses for the realization of the goals set by the program, it was necessary to work out precise and correct tactics. The Provisional Bureau for the Organization of Popular Masses was formed for that purpose. Since in itself the formation of this institution was clearly not enough, a political school was opened to train the agitator cadres for work among the masses and to train militant activists recruited from among the people and this school provided short-term education in the basic questions of revolution and Marxist-Leninist theory.

Each of these two institutions made its own great contribution to the victory of the revolutionary policy and to protecting the popular masses from the refined counterrevolutionary propaganda. In addition to this, the steps and measures taken to have the cadres trained mainly in the Soviet Union as well as in other friendly socialist countries were also of considerable importance.

The formation of the provisional Bureau for the Organization of Popular Masses and of the political school was connected with the revolutionary government's task of ensuring all possible conditions for the formation of a vanguard party. The revolutionaries were able to receive the necessary hardening through the interaction of these two institutions. The existence of these and other favorable circumstances made it necessary to form a single united organization which would guide the strengthened political groups toward the common goal.

It was precisely for this reason that, while preserving their individuality and their own programs and leadership, the organizations which supported the revolution formed the Union of Marxist-Leninist Organizations of Ethiopia (UMLOE) in February 1977.

Because during the period when the Union of Marxist-Leninist Organizations of Ethiopia was formed, our revolution was threatened by internal and external counterrevolutionary forces and the situation was fraught with further aggravations, all this indisputably required the unity of all revolutionary forces, however, under the conditions of an intensified counterrevolutionary offensive, some of the member organizations of this union that had proved themselves to be unprepared for the long road to our ultimate goals, began openly to proclaim their previous hidden plans and aspirations. They did not limit themselves to this alone and definitely and finally left the revolutionary camp.

But the organizations that remained in the Union and supported the revolutionary army made an important contribution to the struggle waged against the counterrevolutionary forces and aggressors in the cities and villages.

This was the positive aspect of the activity of the Union of Marxist-Leninist Organizations of Ethiopia. However, at the same time, the Union could not escape the negative trends that once again appeared within it. At that time, the planned tactic of forming a vanguard party encountered new difficulties. Disagreements appeared as a result of the rivalry for leadership among the organizations that remained in the Union. The bickering and strife spread beyond its framework and had a negative effect on the activity of social organizations. The antipopular forces hastened to exploit the exacerbated situation. It was easier now to penetrate the camp of the advocates of the revolution and to introduce discord into it. It became perfectly obvious that the planned tactic of forming the party by simply uniting these organizations would not succeed. Therefore, the organizations that remained in the Union of Marxist-Leninist Organizations of Ethiopia realized that, regardless of the wasted efforts, there was absolutely no chance for success in continuing their previous policy and therefore decided to form a vanguard party on the basis of a single unified center that would include the revolutionaries chosen on the basis of the principle of comprehensive consideration of their personal qualities. Proceeding from this decision, the revolutionary leadership formed the Commission for Organizing of the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia (COPWE) in December 1979.

It is well-known that the leadership provided by a vanguard party represents the only reliable guarantee for the victory of a people's revolution which has set the construction of socialism as its goal. And in this connection, the process of forming such a party depends on the historical period concerned, the disposition of the class forces and the extent of the revolutionary movement, and is marked by its own forms and characteristic features which are not determined only by the wishes and aspirations of the individual revolutionaries or groups of them, but also by the objective situation. In some countries, the parties are formed through the unification of the circles for the study of Marxist-Leninist theory and in others they are formed through a merger of the individual organizations or parties on the basis of the unity of their goals and tasks. As the experience of some African and Asian countries of the socialist orientation that have recently liberated themselves from the colonial yoke shows, the national liberation fronts in these countries can adopt Marxism-Leninism as a weapon of their struggle and then gradually grow into vanguard parties.

The formation of COPWE by the decree of the Provisional Military Administrative Council, which had made continuous, steadfast efforts over a long period to unite the country's revolutionaries and form the workers party, was a step that was in accord with the specific conditions in Ethiopia and was based on the aspirations and complete support of the working masses. The correctness of this policy was not determined only by an objective analysis of the specific conditions of the period, but also by a number of other circumstances, something that has been confirmed in practice by the results of COPWE'S activity during the more than 4 years of its existence.

The fulfillment of COPWE'S tasks in disseminating Marxism-Leninism among the masses of the working people and in forming a vanguard party based on this ideology has proved the feasibility of the tasks. The measures taken by the Commission toward the goal of formulating the party were divided into three stages--preparatory stage, the stage of developed activity and the final stage--during which COPWE, on one hand, by forming the structure of its organs and, on the other, carrying out its agitation and organizational work in the society, prepared the conditions for the formation of the Workers Party of Ethiopia and thereby fulfilled its mission and laid a reliable foundation for ensuring our party's leading role in the future.

Since COPWE itself is not a party and since its task was only to prepare the conditions for the formation of such a party and to inculcate its members with the habits of internal party activity, and in view of the revolution's development, the assertion of a firm discipline and, on the whole, a clearly expressed centralism were necessary elements of its work.

During the more than 4 years of its existence, COPWE has held two congresses and eight regular and one extraordinary plenums of its Central Committee which discussed the problems of the country's international situation and the questions of the commission's activity and determined the appropriate principles of work. All this helped us acquire experience of ideological and organizational activity. Concerning itself with increasing its numerical strength, COPWE has devoted constant attention to representatives of the workers class and peasantry as the main motive forces of the revolution and has thereby broadened and strengthened a reliable social basis of the future party.

All successes of the revolution are the result of active participation of the working people in it, something that represents a source of the growth in the political awareness of the people, which is necessary for the fulfillment of more difficult future tasks. Disseminating the Marxist-Leninist ideology among the masses of the working people has been one of COPWE'S most important tasks. To participate in the struggle for the goals of the revolution, the masses must base their everyday activity on this ideology as a scientific revolutionary guidance for action.

The ideological work includes the theoretical, propaganda and agitation activity and therefore the efforts aimed at disseminating the Marxist-Leninist ideology among society through the weekly newspaper of the COPWE Central Committee SERTO ADER (THE WORKING MAN) and the quarterly theoretical journal MESKEREM (September), as well as by dispatching cadres for their ideological training to the political schools in the country and abroad, by extensively using the possibilities of the COPWE primary organizations, discussion forums and circles to train new COPWE members and through the state mass information media, have resulted in serious changes in the society's spiritual life.

The circulation of the aforementioned publications testifies to the great attention devoted by COPWE to disseminating the Marxist-Leninist ideology in Ethiopia: 103,000 copies of the newspaper SERTO ADER and 113,000 copies of the journal MESKEREM are printed. A large quantity of foreign Marxist-

Leninist publications, including some translated into the languages of the country's nationalities, are also distributed in Ethiopia. Particular importance from this viewpoint is attached to the translation of the first volume of "Das Kapital," the fundamental work of the great Karl Marx, teacher and leader of workers of the entire world, into Amharic (the first ever translation of this work into an African language). The translation has been completed and the reading public will receive the book during the party congress. Work will continue in the future to translate, publish and distribute other volumes of "Das Kapital" as well as other basic works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

One of the striking proofs of our successes in ideological work is the fact that we have succeeded in arousing the masses of the working people in the struggle for the practical fulfillment of the revolution's goals and in uniting their forces and that we have been able to neutralize the influence of counterrevolutionary propaganda of various types among them.

The final stage of the COPWE'S activity to form the party began on the eve of the second COPWE congress when, as a result of a qualitative and quantitative perfecting of its organizational work, the commission considerably strengthened its leading teams, when its ties with the working masses were even further consolidated and when, thanks to its activity, the main conditions for the formation of the party were ensured.

The organizational and ideological measures to be carried out within COPWE and in society during the final stage of the party's formation were outlined in the plan adopted at the Sixth Plenum of the COPWE Central Committee which was held in accordance with the decisions and directives of the Second COPWE Congress and they have been successfully carried out. Among these measures, the drafting of the party's statute and program and the development of practical activities on the basis of these drafts are of enormous importance.

The formation of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia under the leadership of the Workers Party of Ethiopia ((WPE)) through the organization of a new all-people's political system is the most important current task of the revolution. It is in conformity with this task that the WPE Draft Program devotes primary attention to intensifying the struggle for building the foundations of socialism simultaneously with the process of building the structure of the republic. The drafting of this program was one of the most important measures required for the conclusion of the final stage of the party formation on which the Sixth Plenum of the COPWE Central Committee adopted a special decision. In accordance with the plenum's instructions, upon their completion the party's Draft Program and Statutes were submitted for consideration by all COPWE members in order to qualitatively improve their content with the prospect of their adoption by the WPE constituent congress.

The next important direction of COPWE'S activity in the final stage was to hold constituent party meetings and conferences at all levels. These meetings and conferences, ranging from the level of primary organizations to the level of administrative districts, were successfully held. They formed the leading bodies of their corresponding party organizations and democratically elected their delegates to the WPE constituent congress. The problem of forming a

leading party, for the solution of which a heroic struggle has been waged from the very beginning of the revolution, will be finally and definitely solved at the WPE constituent congress. And it is perfectly clear that the formation of the party will open a new chapter in the struggle for the organization of a new society.

The Ethiopian revolution, which set itself both antifeudal and anti-imperialist goals in its first steps and which has steadfastly followed this policy by strengthening its achievements in various fields during the struggle, is now in the process of concluding one of the most important stages of its development: its immediate historical goal is to ensure the conditions for a transition to building socialism.

We are firmly convinced of our victory under the party's militant leadership because the WPE is the vanguard and leading organization of society, the organization whose program indicates its course and outlines the entire complex of measures on the basis of a scientific analysis of the national, all-African and international conditions, taking into consideration the contemporary level of development of the revolution in Ethiopia. The scientific nature of the content of the program as well as the creation of reliable material and spiritual conditions for laying the foundations of the new society even further strengthen our conviction of this.

The transformations in the political sphere during the 10 years of the Ethiopian revolution have made a direct and important contribution to setting up a political system that reflects the interests of the people. An entire series of measures has been carried out, ranging from the measures to break up the most important institutions of power of the reactionary feudal regime to those of changing the structure of the state apparatus in the interest of the revolution and of forming new state organs. The necessary organizational preparations have already been made by these organs toward achieving the goals of the revolution. However, today, too, a certain work practice inherited from the old bureaucratic apparatus represents an obstacle in regard to this question. At the same time, some experience has already been accumulated which is of great importance for overcoming these difficulties by creating at all levels the necessary conditions for expanding the participation of the working masses in the activities of administration organs and in economic management, something that will make possible an activation of the work of the state institutions on a democratic basis.

Certain social organizations whose activity is inseparable from the process of development of the revolution have been formed to enable the working people to more fruitfully use the opportunities available to them. We have now reached the stage at which the social organizations participate--both individually and jointly--in solving various tasks facing the country. All this points to a constantly increasing proportional participation of social organizations in the functioning of the entire political system and to the fact that the working masses are accumulating and developing experience in self-government.

To build the necessary material foundation for the political power of the working people, a multitude of radical socioeconomic measures have been taken in the last 10 years in order to guarantee and constantly raise the standard

of living of the working people and to ensure social and economic justice. The basic industrial and marketing enterprises, banks and other financial institutions as well as land and all revenue housing have been nationalized and have become the property of the people. The process of socialization of the small-scale commodity production enterprises is being intensified in Ethiopia both in cities and in villages in order to prevent their development along the road of capitalism. Favorable conditions have already been created in the country for the socialist production relations to assume a dominant position on the basis of the state and cooperative economy. Nonetheless, considering that these favorable conditions are insufficient for building real socialism, we are placing emphasis on the further development of those production forces which play a decisive role.

Certain economic projects have been carried out in order to build the material-technical basis of the socialist economy; these projects were initiated within the framework of the existing and developing cooperation with the socialist countries.

Proceeding from the available possibilities, organizational and administrative measures have been taken to further develop and strengthen the socialist production relations. A scientifically built structure of the centralized planning organs, ensuring the most effective conditions for their activities, has been created for the purpose of economic leadership. A long-term 10-year economic and social development plan has been drafted and, following its adoption by the WPE constituent congress, it will be implemented with the direct participation of the state and social organizations. We are now making efforts to consolidate the socialist system of economic management on the basis of controlling the activity of the private sector of the economy and the development of its social sector.

The achievements of the revolution in raising the standard of living of the working people cannot satisfy us because we are at a very low level of development and, at the same time, are constantly encountering the obstacles erected by the reactionary forces. However, these achievements also should not be underrated because they are a real herald of the coming bright future.

The appropriate labor legislation has already been adopted in our country which protects the interests of workers and which determines the minimum wage levels. This legislation has guaranteed work for workers and has also created the conditions for safeguarding their other basic rights. The principle of equal pay for equal work has been almost entirely implemented in the state sector of the economy. The workers have been granted the right to participate in production management and in settling production conflicts. A system of labor agreements ensuring the rights of workers has been introduced.

The reduction of high housing rents and the free allotment of plots for the construction of residential housing on the basis of the decree on the nationalization of urban and revenue housing was an enormously important measure aimed at raising the income level of the masses of the working people and improving their life. Some wage increases for the low-paid categories of workers and the granting of free medical treatment for them have also been events of considerable importance. During the revolution, numerous practical

measures have been taken to help especially needy citizens with pension insurance and financial compensation for industrial injuries by setting up a social insurance system as a whole, by eliminating such negative social phenomena as unemployment, prostitution and so forth. However, because all these problems represent the inheritance of centuries of the feudal system, we still have a great deal to accomplish to eliminate them once and for all.

Since the very beginning of the revolution, great attention has been devoted to providing medical treatment for the popular masses. Many clinics and medical stations have been set up in rural districts where the major part of the population lives. The number of public health workers has increased manyfold in comparison with the prerevolutionary period. At present, medical treatment is available to 43 percent of the country's population as compared with only 15 percent in the prerevolutionary period.

The struggle continues for a new education system whose content and form will correspond to the tasks of building a new society, as well as for increasing education opportunities for the population. In the last 10 years, the number of children's institutions ranging from kindergartens to secondary level schools has significantly increased as compared with the prerevolutionary period. In the same period, the number of children attending education institutions at all levels has increased threefold.

The struggle to eliminate illiteracy is the next most important achievement of the revolution. In the last 5 years alone, the level of illiteracy has been reduced from 93 percent to 37 percent of the population. A program for a new stage in the campaign against illiteracy has been prepared in order to achieve even greater successes in this sphere and this program is already virtually being implemented. This campaign is waged in the languages of the 15 nationalities of Ethiopia. By 1983, 28 million copies of book editions in these languages had been printed and distributed.

We are convinced that the work accomplished in organizing the new education system has made its contribution to the development of a progressive popular culture. On the whole, the ideological, political, economic and social measures implemented have made it possible for us to ensure the necessary material and spiritual prerequisites for creating a new culture. The measures aimed at the struggle against the backward customs and traditions inherited from the old reactionary system and at activating the activities of workers in building a new society, has resulted in great changes in the content of the arts of various types.

The victories won in the past 10 years since the beginning of the advance of the broad popular masses of Ethiopia along the chosen road of true progress have radically transformed the socioeconomic structure of our society as well as its political life. Firm foundations for the developed spiritual and material life of the working people of Ethiopia are now being built.

In the contemporary period, in which it is impossible to stand aside from international life, the revolutionary events in any country also evoke a response beyond its borders. The results of the struggle that has developed in various spheres in our country in the last 10 years have not only moved the

Ethiopian working people closer to achieving true freedom but have undoubtedly also made their contribution to strengthening the world anti-imperialist forces.

The example of the Ethiopian revolution is of particularly great importance for the African continent which, after the collapse of the system of colonialism, yearns not for imaginary but for real political freedom and economic independence for its peoples and for the liquidation of imperialist dominance.

It is well-known that, although the Ethiopian popular masses lived under the conditions of extreme backwardness prior to the revolution, they were able to preserve their sovereignty over a long period, something which provided an example for fighters for the independence of African countries. For several centuries, the Ethiopian people continued to repulse the repeated aggressions of European colonizers. Thus, the victory near Adua against the well-armed Italian colonial army in 1896 provided a bright page in the history of anticolonial struggle of the African continent.

And today, too, the victories of our revolution in various spheres are considered by the peoples of many African countries as a model. The fighters for liberation in other countries of the world look with hope at our country. For its part, revolutionary Ethiopia supports as much as it can the fighters against apartheid on our continent and, on the whole, all the forces that fight for freedom.

Revolutionary Ethiopia is one of the countries participating in the vanguard struggle for increasing the role of the OAU, for the liberation of the continent from various forms of the imperialist influence and for the liquidation of backwardness through joint efforts. Ethiopia is making its contribution to the struggle against the attempts of the forces of imperialism and their minions which have been repeatedly made in the recent period and have been aimed at breaking up our continental organization. In the future, too, revolutionary Ethiopia will continue its steadfast efforts to further strengthen this organization and intensify its activities aimed at ensuring an independent economic and social development of African peoples.

The foreign policy of revolutionary Ethiopia is based on the principles of proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence and respect for the UN and OAU Charters and the principles of the Nonaligned Movement. Proceeding from this stance, our country will continue also in future to make its contribution, together with the world's peace-loving forces, to the common struggle against the plots of international imperialism and especially U. S. imperialism, which are pushing the world toward a nuclear catastrophe. Today, Ethiopia participates in the struggle of peoples of the world to preserve peace on earth, the struggle in the vanguard of which is the Soviet Union.

By forming the WPE and with the celebration of its 10th anniversary in September this year in which our numerous foreign friends will participate, our revolution will enter a new stage. During the past years of difficult struggle, we have destroyed the feudal system and now, following the formation of the party leadership, we will turn our main attention to the questions of

active struggle for the formation of the new political system that will reflect the interests of all people. The process of building the Ethiopian People's Democratic Republic will be dominant in this struggle and will play a decisive role in building socialism and in ensuring the direct participation of the working masses in performing the tasks of the state. This is the first and main task of our party.

Having won victory after victory, our revolution has now reached a sufficiently high level of development thanks to the struggle of the working masses and all revolutionaries. The success of our entire future struggle will be based on this achievement. We are convinced that the victories won by our revolution, which firmly stands on anti-imperialist positions, are not limited to the benefits which they have brought us. They have made their contribution to the consolidation of the forces on our planet which are struggling for peace, freedom, democracy and social progress. At the same time, we are grateful to all internationalists who have extended and continue to extend the necessary assistance and support to our revolution in achieving its historical successes and fulfilling the tasks facing us now. Proceeding from the principles of proletarian internationalism, we will continue our efforts to further strengthen the ties with the Soviet Union and other countries as well as with the revolutionary, democratic and peace-loving forces throughout the world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/1

COMMUNISTS AND BELIEVERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 99-108

[Article by Prof N. Koval'skiy, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The second half of the 20th century is repeatedly proving that the broad masses of believers are opposing the unfairness of the capitalist society. They are discovering through personal experience the antipeople's nature of imperialist domestic and foreign policy. Imperialism is increasingly exposing itself in the eyes of the believers. Nevertheless, it is doing everything possible to use religion and religious forces in the struggle against the insurmountable course of history.

These forces are quite heterogeneous. Naturally, the worker and the entrepreneur trapped by a religious outlook cannot have the same approach to the social and political phenomena in the same manner that a simple priest, who shares in most cases the hardships and difficulties of his flock has frequently a different view of the world around him than would a bishop or a cardinal who is linked with the top strata of capitalist society. This is also reflected in the political views of the various levels of religious circles and their evaluation of specific events. A separation based on social and, above all, class characteristics leads to the fact that the various groups of supporters of the same church frequently show disparate views not only about specific problems of national and domestic policy but also most important global problems of our time, including the struggle against the threat of war and for social progress.

However, it would be simplistic to link the political views of one segment of religious forces or another merely with their social affiliation, for such views are also shaped under the influence of the subjective factor. Thus, whereas a certain segment of the religious circles is aware of the threat of nuclear war and social injustice under capitalism--from the positions of faith and religious ideology--and understands the humanistic nature of socialism, or to put it briefly, has a realistic attitude toward reality, another part of these circles is dominated by reactionary ideas and is a prisoner of anticommunism. In other words, the sociopolitical activities of religious forces are by no means identical and reflect, although through the lens of a religious awareness, contradictions within contemporary social life.

Such contradictions above all affect religious consciousness itself. In the contemporary world, on the one hand we have a weakening of religion and a decline in religious faith as such, a faith in supernatural forces and in the afterlife. On the other, we face the growth of sociopolitical activeness of believers, their organizations, church-oriented political parties and the churches themselves.

Such contradictions are manifested in all basic realms of social life.

Religious forces have become a major structural component of antiwar movements and the struggle for peace. Compared with the 1950s, the believers and their organizations are standing up more firmly against the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe, the deployment of new American missiles in Europe in particular.

The antiwar feelings of the broad believer masses could not fail to reflect on the positions of the church leadership as well. Today the largest international church centers are condemning the arms race and opposing nuclear weapons to a greater or lesser extent, although not always consistently. The pastoral message of U.S. Roman Catholic bishops, who questioned President Reagan's nuclear policy, has become quite well-known. The same is confirmed by practices in other countries, the activities of the Evangelical Church in the FRG in particular, which organized mass demonstrations in that country in the 1980s, and other similar actions.

Working people in capitalist countries, who are religious believers, are joining the antimonopoly struggle. The activeness of Christian trade unions and worker organizations and Catholic Action, their laic organization, and their associations, both national and international, has increased considerably in a number of Western European countries, although many members of such organizations are gradually abandoning the church and attending increasingly fewer services considered mandatory for Roman Catholics. This confirms a general de-Christianizing of the working class and a weakening and, in a number of cases, a crisis of church influence among workers.

A liberation struggle waged under religious slogans is spreading in Asian, Latin American and African countries. It is precisely in Latin America, for example, that the term "rebellious church" was born. A peculiar system of religious views on problems of the liberation struggle has appeared--a "theology of liberation"--which has been the subject of strong Vatican attacks of late. Some members of religious circles are experiencing the attractiveness of socialist ideas. This has been refracted in the dissemination of the concept of "Islamic socialism," the appearance of the "Christians for Socialism" movement, etc.

Recent events have confirmed the relevance of Marx's familiar concept that "religious squalor is both an expression of actual squalor and a protest against this actual squalor" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 1, p 415). The entire point is which one of these features is dominant under specific circumstances, which social force expresses either of these trends and what direction do its activities follow? In a word, as was pointed out in

the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th Party Congress, what matters is the objective pursued by forces proclaiming one slogan or another. A liberation and anti-imperialist struggle may be mounted under religious slogans although counterrevolutionary mutinies can break out as well.

As we know, Engels included the Peasant War in Germany among the revolutionary wars which broke out under a religious banner and noted the existence of "revolutionary religious-political ideas during the time of the Reformation," when heresy "was the direct expression of the needs of the peasants and the plebeians and was almost always combined with an uprising" (op. cit., vol 7, pp 359, 362). However, actions under the flag of religion have rarely brought their participants--the people's masses--the desired results. The influence of the illusory aspect of religion was one of the factors affecting their outcome.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that not only believers but members of the clergy could participate in revolutionary movements. In describing the position of the Russian clergy in the 1905 revolution, he wrote that autocracy triggered a "discontent, a ferment and indignation even among the clergy.... Even the clergy was awakened by the thunder of the collapse of the old medieval order in Rus. Even the clergy is joining in the demand for freedom, objecting to officialdom and bureaucratic arbitrariness and opposing police investigations of 'the servants of God.' We, socialists, must support this movement and lead to the end the demands of honest and sincere members of the clergy..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 12, p 144).

Today as well individual members of the clergy participate in the revolutionary and, occasionally, even the armed struggle waged against dictatorial regimes and U.S. imperialist policy in Latin American countries, actively joining social movements and participating in antiwar actions.

At the same time, along with the "rebellious" side of the activities of religious forces, another meaning for their social actions stems from the very essence of religion. It is determined by the function which religion plays as the "opiate of the people" (Marx) and "spiritual raw vodka" (Lenin). Naturally, today this function is manifested in a somewhat transformed shape and its means and methods of manifestation are different. Its essence, however, remains the same. The "opiate" maims the consciousness of the masses and thus hinders social progress. This function is represented by the right wing of religious circles, acting as the tool and accomplice of imperialism.

Naturally, the possibility of performing this function is retained because capitalist reality is a nutritive medium for religion. Whereas some people react to the capitalist crisis by withdrawing from religions, others develop mystical feelings, which may include extreme manifestations such as belief in the occult. Fear of the future, lack of prospects, the threat of war, the negative consequences of the scientific and technical revolution and psychological suppression create the need for spiritual consolation and some people find this "spiritual joy" (Marx) in various manifestations of religious faith.

As the French communists have pointed out, the concept that "religion is the opium of the masses" means "to Marx and to us the fact that religion belongs to the realm of philosophical idealism and, actually, is a false or distorted understanding of the real world, thereby taking man away from action in this real world" (M. Thorez, W. Rochet and G. Marchais, "Communistes et chretiens" [Communists and Christians]. Paris, 1976, p 126).

The imperialist forces try to use this precise religious trend deliberately and actively in their ideological and political influence on the masses, countering the trend toward the revolutionary reorganization of the world. To this effect they resort to the services not only of the most reactionary part of the clergy, essentially among its higher levels, but the Christian Democratic and other similar parties which sometimes are in power in capitalist countries. In creating their own youth, women's and other organizations, the reactionary clerical forces are trying to divide the ranks of the working class, while the monopolies finance the parties and organizations which exploit the religious feelings, superstitions and prejudices of the working people.

Z. Brzezinski has repeatedly mentioned the interest of ruling U.S. circles in using the weapon of religion in foreign policy. The present American administration as well pays close attention to work with religious circles both within the United States and abroad. The White House itself is involved in this, side by side with the CIA and other governmental departments. Actually, the religious rhetoric of its master, his views on "sin and evil" in the contemporary world and hysterical appeals for a "crusade" are the drugs with which the common sense not of believers exclusively would like to dull. The purpose of the religious phraseology borrowed from the Middle Ages is not only to reduce to a primitive level, to distort the most complex problems of our time, but to attain a most definite official purpose: to justify the expansion of American imperialism in the world arena.

Washington is relying on religious circles also in dividing the antiwar movement and in its efforts to redirect it against the USSR.

Clerical reaction is manifested in a variety of fields. In the ideological-political area it promotes clerical anticommunism, supports anticommunist forces and serves them loyally. Its main trend of activity in this area is the struggle against Marxist-Leninist theory, the communist movement and real socialism. Contemporary clerical anticommunism and its struggle against scientific communism are becoming increasingly refined and subtler than in the past. Arguments borrowed from today's revisionist and opportunists are used widely.

In the social area the reactionary role of clericalism is manifested in countering political and ideological trends which call for replacing the capitalist with a socialist system and efforts to strengthen the capitalist system. Turning to many of the ideological documents of the Roman Catholic Church on problems of labor and the working class, for example, it becomes obvious that along with paying dues to our times--acknowledging individual faulty features in capitalism--they reveal above all the desire to preserve and perpetuate it. This makes Marx's words topical: "The social principles

of Christianity justified slavery in antiquity, praised medieval serfdom and, whenever necessary, stands up against the oppression of the proletariat although with a pitifully twisted face" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 4, p 204). The relevance of this thought is confirmed by a number of concepts found in the Vatican encyclicals, including "Laborem Exsercens" (1981) which calls upon the toiling masses to abandon the active struggle and to the ruling classes to make capitalism more humane.

In the area of international relations the activities of the clerical reaction are manifested in the open or covert support of U.S. and NATO imperialist foreign policy, in drawing the believers away from the active struggle against the arms race and the aspiration to implant anti-Sovietism through its specific means, the myth of the "Soviet threat" in particular.

The function of religion as the opiate of the masses is manifested in religious fanaticism quite clearly and, sometimes, even tragically. Could the 1978 tragedy in the jungles of Guyana have been possible without the total dulling of the minds? In this case the 914 members of the People's Temple religious community, who had come from the United States, committed suicide. Is it not the same fanaticism which guides the activities of a number of religious sects, activities which would have been simply impossible without such a base? These are the same grounds for religious communal discord in India. Innumerable similar cases could be cited.

II

How do the communist movement and the foreign communist parties react to the various forms of religious activity in the modern world and to the activities of religious forces? In this area of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine as well, the historical experience gained by the communists enables them to be properly guided and to formulate specific practical solutions.

Lenin explained that "in no case should the communists...be deflected by the abstract and idealistic formulation of the religious question "with the mind" and remain outside the class struggle..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 12, p 146). Lenin considered the class struggle in which atheists and believers would participate jointly the most accurate way of surmounting religious prejudices. He pointed out that the struggle against religion is not self-seeking. The purpose is the implementation of the historical mission of the working class, i.e., the substitution of socialism, which can be achieved through the class struggle. "Unity between this truly revolutionary struggle waged by the working class for the creation of heaven on earth is more important to us than the unity of views of the proletariat as to heaven in the skies," Lenin wrote. "...We neither forbid nor should forbid the members of the proletariat who have preserved one vestige or another of the old prejudices, to come closer to our party," he added. Lenin opposed "giving priority which does not belong to it to the religious problem." He opposed, therefore, "a splintering of the forces of the actual revolutionary, economic and political struggle for the sake of third-rate opinions or ravings...." (ibid.).

However, such a "rapprochement" does not mean ideological capitulation in the least. "We shall always preach a scientific outlook and must struggle against the inconsistency of 'Christians'....," Lenin emphasized (ibid.).

As early as the 1920s and 1930s the young communist parties made active use of the prerevolutionary experience of the Russian Bolsheviks, consistent with the new circumstances and national characteristics. They were also able to rely on the best and truly revolutionary experience which the progressive labor movement in Western Europe had acquired by then. The proclamation by Maurice Thorez of the policy of the "offered hand," in 1936, soon after the 7th Comintern Congress, aimed at cooperation between communists and Catholics in the struggle against fascism and the prevention of a second world war, was of great importance in the formulation of a principled approach to the problem of relations between communists and religious forces. This political line, which was supported by the other communist parties, played a major role during the war as well, in helping to rally communists and Christians within the Resistance.

During the postwar period the international communist movement returned to this important problem, above all in connection with the new tasks of the struggle for peace and social progress. The role of all people in the struggle for peace and social progress, regardless of religious conviction, was stated at the 1957 Conference of Representatives of Communist and Worker Parties. The 1960 conference directly appealed for the unification of all forces of the working class. The question was raised again at the 1967 Karlovy Vary conference. It was developed in the greatest detail in the resolutions of the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Worker Parties, which considered the possibilities of an alliance between the revolutionary worker movement and the broad masses of believers on an antimonopoly and anti-imperialist basis. The conference noted that such cooperation is already developing successfully in some countries. The range of problems on which a dialogue should be conducted with the democratic masses of Roman Catholics and believers in other religions was defined for the sake of taking joint action in resolving problems of war and peace and struggling against imperialism and neocolonialism and for national freedom, democracy and socialism. The conference noted that it is precisely through extensive contacts and joint actions that the believers' mass can become an active force in the anti-imperialist struggle and in making deep social changes.

The 1976 Berlin Conference of Communist and Worker Parties of Europe was able to sum up certain results of this policy.

Therefore, the world communist movement protest from the fact that, to begin with, the problem of religion and religious forces should be assessed and considered in accordance with the sociopolitical changes occurring in the contemporary world; secondly, the religious working people are an important force in the antimonopoly struggle and the struggle for radical social changes; thirdly, the believer masses are interested in preventing a new world war and in the success of the struggle for peace and antiwar movements. Naturally, in this case each communist party pursues these common basic views in accordance with the characteristics of its area and country and their historical traditions, national differences and social systems.

The attitude of the communist parties toward religious problems in developed capitalist countries has its own specifics. In this group of countries the believers are undergoing a training in the class struggle under the conditions of highly intensive antimonopoly actions and strikes on different levels. For example, powerful antiwar actions developed in Western Europe and the United States. Under these circumstances, the members of the various cults are increasingly realizing the justice of the objective for which the communists are fighting. The foundations of cooperation are hammered out in the crucible of the joint struggle, in the guise of ties and contacts among trade unions and a variety of political and social organizations. Cooperation on an individual basis between communists and supporters of religious views appears as well.

Typically, some believers consider membership in communist and worker parties compatible with their ideals. The communist view on this account is well-known. "We must," Lenin wrote, "not only admit but specifically attract all working people who still believe in God within the social democratic party. We strictly oppose even the slightest insult of their religious beliefs. However, we are attracting them for the sake of educating them in the spirit of our program rather than for actively fighting against it" (op. cit., vol 17, p 422). Lenin deemed correct the fact that the RSDWP Program did not stipulate that "we are atheists" (see op. cit., vol 12, p 145).

Such Leninist views had been reflected in the statutes of a number of communist parties in capitalist countries (France, Austria, Canada and others).

Today the ferment in religious circles has reached such a degree that even individual members of the clergy are leaning toward the communists. How do the parties act in such cases?

Here again they are helped by the experience of the Russian bolsheviks. "One must not proclaim once and for all and under all circumstances that priests cannot be members of the social democratic party. However, nor should one proclaim the opposite rule once and for all," Lenin wrote in his work "On the Attitude of the Workers Party Toward Religion" in 1909. He further explained that "if a priest comes to us for joint political work and conscientiously does party work without opposing the party program we can accept him in the ranks of the social democratic party, for the contradiction between the spirit and foundations of our program and the religious convictions of the priest may, under such circumstances, affect him alone, becoming his personal contradiction; a political organization cannot test its members for the lack of contradictions between their views and the party program" (op. cit., vol 17, p 422). However, the attitude of the communist party toward religion is not, in their case, a private matter, in accordance with Lenin's definition. A scientific outlook is an inseparable feature of any truly communist party, as stipulated in its programs and bylaws.

The party members master a Marxist, a dialectical-materialistic outlook, within the framework of ideological education work. Thus, the Portuguese Communist Party emphasizes the significance of disseminating the principles of Marxism-Leninism as the foundations for the education of cadres and

intensifying the struggle against an ideology alien to the working class. The party of the Portuguese communists sets itself the task of "helping the party members to master Marxism-Leninism and intensifying their political and ideological knowledge" ("IX S"yezd Portugal'skoy Kommunisticheskoy Partii" [9th Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party]. Moscow, 1980, p 313).

The bylaws of the Greek Communist Party demand of its members "to work tirelessly on strengthening their Marxist-Leninist ideological tempering...."

The most important educational means is the participation of believers in daily party work, in the class and revolutionary struggle and in the activities of the party in defending the interests of every working and ordinary person, in the course of which the humanistic power of the intellectual and moral potential of consistent scientific materialism is attained and the power of its influence on human minds and hearts is manifested.

This is the situation concerning the attitude of the communists toward the current problems faced by religion, the church and religious forces. How do they view long-term prospects? What do they offer to the believers in this respect? Thus, in its new program (1982) the U.S. Communist Party proclaims that in socialist America "the separation between church and state will be observed and the right to have religious beliefs and to practice religious cults will be recognized." The program of the Canadian Communist Party "The Path to Socialism in Canada" stipulates that "the citizens will be free to practice their religion or to disseminate antireligious views."

Many problems related to the attitudes of the communists toward believers assume a specific aspect in the young states and in the national liberation zone. This is understandable, for it is precisely here that the development of the liberation struggle under the banner of religion has become quite clear, on the one hand, and the use of religion and religious fanaticism by imperialism and the forces of feudalism and reaction, as tools of violence and all kinds of oppression, on the other.

The communist parties apply the Marxist-Leninist theory of religion to the specific reality of the developing countries. They firmly support the anti-imperialist struggle in which the believers and their organizations participate and prevent the use of religion by the forces of imperialism and right-wing circles.

As was noted at the 1984 Conference of Communist Parties of South American Countries, the development of the liberation struggle in that area contributes to the noticeable participation in the people's movement of the believer masses and, frequently, the church itself or some of its most realistically thinking personalities.

The communist parties favor the creation of broad democratic fronts in the struggle against imperialism and the local oligarchy. Thus, after the fascist coup of 1973 in Chile, the communist party published a manifesto calling upon the Christian democrats to rally in the struggle against the Pinochet regime. In February 1982 it once again claimed its loyalty in the struggle to unity of

action with Christian democrats. At the same time, the communists are fighting clerical reaction and anticommunism which hides behind religion and oppose the accomplices of U.S. imperialism in the church.

In Asia and the Islamic Arab countries the communists' attitude toward the religious convictions of the people who profess this religion is based on their evaluation of the role which it actually performs. They see that a liberation struggle can develop under the banners of Islam. This is confirmed by historical experience. However, this same experience indicates that Islamic slogans are used by the reaction as well, which foments counterrevolutionary mutinies and benefits from U.S. support. We do not have to look far for examples: they are found in the subversive activities of the Muslim Brotherhood and attempts to hinder the development of Afghanistan on the path earmarked by the April Revolution. The 1984 Declaration of Communist and Worker Parties of Arab Countries emphasizes the significance of the struggle against reactionary ideology, chauvinistic and narrow nationalistic trends, anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, nurtured by imperialism, Zionism and reaction. In clarifying their approach to the problems of Islam, the Marxists-Leninists are promoting among the believers the basic stipulations of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin on religion. They expose the thesis of Arab reaction according to which, by virtue of its atheistic nature, Marxism is inapplicable in Muslim countries. The communists point out that the forces which are guided by Marxist-Leninist theory deem it their task not to abolish religion but to reorganize society.

These ideas are clearly expressed in the new action program of the Afghan National Democratic Party.

Here the state guarantees the rights and freedoms of Muslims; religious institutions, religious leaders and believers are guaranteed support in anything related to their religious activities. In particular, the state shows constant concern for the mosques and the preservation of sacred Muslim sites and helps pilgrims make the journey to Mecca and other sacred Muslim places. The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan states that it will not tolerate the attempts of the enemies of the April Revolution to use Islam to turn the people away from their chosen path.

III

Naturally, the claim cannot be made that cooperation between communists, on the one hand, and believers and leading representatives of religious circles, on the other, is smooth and unobstructed and that difficulties are not encountered along its way.

Let us emphasize above all that to the communists such cooperation is no accident but stems from their Marxist-Leninist ideological concepts. In answering the critics who attacked this formulation of the problem, Lenin wrote that "...that which dilettantes or ignoramuses treat as vacillations is a direct and inevitable conclusion based on dialectical materialism. It would be deeply wrong to believe that the seeming 'moderation' of Marxism toward religion is explained with so-called 'tactical' considerations in the sense of the wish 'not to frighten' and so on" (op. cit., vol 17, p 418).

The main feature in the policy of alliances and coalitions is the ability to use it "with a view to enhancing rather than lowering the general level of proletarian consciousness, revolutionism and ability to struggle and win" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 41, p 59). Lenin emphasized that in accepting political compromises we must be able "to preserve, strengthen, temper and develop revolutionary tactics and organization, revolutionary awareness, resolve and preparedness of the working class and its organized vanguard, the communist party" (op. cit., vol 40, p 290).

The Marxist-Leninists realize that political compromises between communists and religious forces are necessary because they help to achieve unity of action and cooperation among toiling masses. At the same time, however, they reject compromises of a conceptual nature. In Lenin's words, one must keep one's own head on one's shoulders and be able to find one's way in each individual case.

In the past it has happened that this Leninist principle has been ignored in conducting a dialogue between Marxists and Christians, the result of which has been nothing but an eclectic mixture of Marxist and Christian elements. R. Garaudy was particularly successful in creating such combinations. In the final account, however, he put himself outside Marxist science and the communist movement.

As we know, the revisionistic course of ideological capitulationism failed the practical test and went bankrupt. Another course earned recognition: not a rapprochement between ideologies but practical cooperation between communists and believers in resolving the most important problems facing the working people and all mankind. This was precisely the direction along which the dialogue developed during the 1970s and 1980s.

Such most important problems include, above all, that of preventing a new world war. The form of dialogue based on specific cooperation for the sake of lifting the threat of war has been expressed, for example, in meetings regularly held between Marxists and Christians within the framework of the International Peace Institute (Vienna). Such a practical and principle-minded dialogue has contributed to the joint cooperation between Marxists and Christians in the struggle for peace. It is continuing to develop successfully within the World Peace Council, the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation and other international mass movements and organizations. The peace marches and antiwar demonstrations of the 1980s were a demonstration of the unity of peace-loving forces, which include both Christians and communists and which showed respect for their reciprocal positions.

Such cooperation in the interests of peace helps to surmount manifestations of inconsistency and hesitations which develop in religious circles and to counter the pressure exerted by imperialist forces on believers and their organizations.

The communists welcome the efforts of anyone who wants peace, who is ready to prevent the outbreak of a global thermonuclear conflict. The 26th CPSU Congress noted the importance of cooperation with all peace-loving forces,

including religious circles, in matters of preventing war and strengthening peace. In the course of the visit to the USSR of O. Palme, the present Swedish prime minister, it was emphasized that the Soviet Union is invariably ready to cooperate with representatives of all political and religious trends in the matter of restraining the arms race and strengthening peace. The Soviet government warmly greeted the participants in the world conference held by "religious leaders in the world against the nuclear threat," who met in Moscow in May 1982. The answer which Comrade K. U. Chernenko gave to the peace message of the municipality of the Italian city of Assisi and the Franciscan Order in March 1984 met with a broad response throughout the world. "As we know communists and Roman Catholics have different philosophical views," Comrade K. U. Chernenko pointed out. "However, this does not prevent us from struggling jointly for peace, when it is threatened by a grave menace." The creation of a public commission by the Soviet Peace Committee for establishing contacts with religious circles fighting for peace was a manifestation of the aspiration of the Soviet people for extensive cooperation in the struggle against the threat of war.

These are also the positions of the world communist movement. The communists appeal to all peace-loving forces, including Christians and people professing other beliefs with the appeal to establish broad contacts and engage in a dialogue in the interests of peace and prevention of war. All antiwar activities of the communists and their line of unifying all opponents of war confirm their consistent aspiration to guarantee mankind the right to life.

Cooperation between communists and believers is developing successfully in the social area as well in a number of countries. Such cooperation has successfully taken place in recent decades between Christian trade unions and trade unions in which communists participate. Many working believers have participated in mass antimonopoly actions and national strikes together with the communists.

The communists in capitalist countries pay great attention to problems of cooperation with believers in the struggle for social progress. The 24th French Communist Party Congress emphasized that the party will continue to make efforts in favor of positive cooperation with representative Christian circles. The congress addressed an appeal "to the believers sensitive to anything which denigrates man in France and in the rest of the world and who share the hope which originates in the struggle of the people, to believers who would like to give their faith an active social direction" ("XXIV S'yezd Frantsuzskoy Kommunisticheskoy Partii" [24th Congress of the French Communist Party], Moscow, 1982, p 167).

However, the communists are far from idealizing religious circles. They realize that such circles include many opponents of a dialogue and cooperation with the communists. G. Marchais noted in his report to the congress in this connection that the "church hierarchy is creating a number of obstacles to progress along this way. The statements of Pope John Paul II on major social and political problems clash with the aspirations for freedom of our time" (ibid., p 43). The 9th Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party noted the relevance of the struggle against obscurantism which is raising its head.

The communist movement realistically assesses cooperation possibilities among all antiwar and antimonopoly forces under circumstances in which imperialism has mounted an offensive against the vital interests of the broad toiling masses, peace and socialism. The communists see in such cooperation an important factor in the further development of mankind on the path of peace and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/1

DETENTE: ORIGINS AND POTENTIALITIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84) pp 109-120

[Article by Yu. Molchanov]

[Text] Mankind is experiencing an exceptionally difficult and important period in its history. As a result of the efforts of extreme reactionary imperialist circles, the situation in the world has worsened dangerously. It has become extremely alarming and the danger of a global thermonuclear war with its inevitably catastrophic consequences is greater than ever. For the first time world civilization is facing the fatal choice: to be or not to be. Could the sliding of international relations toward the dangerous edge of the nuclear precipice be stopped? Is it possible to revive and intensify the detente which in the 1970s led to a tangible improvement in international relations and substantially benefitted many nations?

"Detente is dead." Such is the substance of the views of the aggressive imperialist circles, the present American administration above all, who are accelerating material preparations for war and, to this effect, are trying to suppress the trend of detente, to eliminate anything related to it and to revive the atmosphere of cold war and frigid confrontation. "I do not think that we need detente...", President Reagan cynically proclaims.

Reactionary propaganda spares no efforts and funds in continuing to present detente as a "trap" and as "Moscow's fraudulent maneuver" which, it is claimed, was able not so long ago to "outwit" the Western politicians who made a serious error in agreeing to detente, as a result of which the most vital interests of the so-called "free world" were harmed. The purpose and meaning of such statements are extremely clear: to discredit detente in the minds of the population in the capitalist countries and to make them mistrustful and inimical toward it and thus to weaken and eliminate opposition to an aggressive militaristic foreign policy.

Furthermore, "realists" and well-meaning skeptics in different social strata have expressed a view which, based on the sharply increased tension in the world, stipulates that the period of detente belongs to the past and that in

today's circumstances to believe that detente has any kind of a future would be, to say the least, not serious and naive.

Essentially the supporters of this viewpoint are mentally prepared, although regretfully, to accept the fact that imperialist reaction has been able to achieve its objective: to seize the initiative in international affairs and to subordinate it to its will. They conceive of the future in terms of an endless arms race and aggravated confrontation between capitalist and socialist countries. They basically abandon the possibility of avoiding a nuclear conflict with its catastrophic consequences and the possibility of rescuing the world and improving the international situation to chance. Some of them even ask us to "be sensible" and undertake unilateral disarmament steps with a view to "setting the example" by the Soviet Union alone, ignoring the indisputable fact that such steps can only increase the appetite of militant imperialist circles.

However, a different political position and a diametrically opposed view exist as well: detente can and must have a future! This is, above all, the opinion of the most influential and responsible political forces of our time--the forces of social progress. This is also the invariable position held by the Soviet Union, the other fraternal socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist communist and worker parties--the tested and consistent fighters against the threat of war and for strengthening peace and the bright future of mankind. "...However difficult the situation in the world may be," stresses the political declaration of Warsaw Pact members, adopted in Prague in January 1983, "possibilities of surmounting this dangerous stage in international relations exist. The present course of events must and can be stopped and its development must be made consistent with the expectations of the peoples." This conclusion was reasserted in the speech by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to the voters on 2 March 1984: "...In the final account, the course of events will once again turn toward strengthening peace, restricting the arms race and developing international cooperation. The roots of detente run deep."

Today this view coincides with that of all those who are seriously concerned about the dangerous situation in the world which threatens the future of all countries and peoples and who realize the need to do everything possible, to make particular efforts to remove this most dangerous threat.

The confident position held by the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist commonwealth is dictated not only by the historical optimism inherent in the communists. It is based on a profound and truly scientific analysis of subjective factors which define the main trends in the development of contemporary international relations and the overall deployment and ratio of sociopolitical forces in the world arena.

As a transition from the dangerous tension which had developed in the world from the period of the cold war to a more normal and healthy relationship between socialist and capitalist countries, detente was not an accidental phenomenon artificially brought to life. It appeared by the turn of the 1970s under the influence of a number of objective prerequisites above all. Most of all, its appearance was based on essentially new imperatives in international

relations such as radical changes in the global ratio of class and political forces, the qualitative change in means of warfare, caused by the development and perfecting of nuclear missiles, with all the consequences stemming from this fact, and the fact that the Soviet Union and the socialist commonwealth as a whole had achieved military strategic parity with the United States and the NATO bloc.

All of this gradually led the most realistic state leaders in most Western countries to recognize the inevitable truth of our time, the fact that a nuclear war cannot be an instrument for attaining any kind of political objectives, for its consequences would be fatal both to the victim of aggression and the attacker.

The objective requirements triggered by the international division of labor and the need to develop mutually profitable trade-economic and scientific and technological and cultural cooperation were other reasons which encouraged putting an end to the cold war and establishing normal and healthy relations and contacts between countries with opposite social systems.

In the political practice of international relations detente came about as a result of efforts made by both sides in the way tunnels are dug in mountains--with the participation, although far from equal, from different starting points, of socialist countries--the Warsaw Pact members--and the capitalist NATO countries, actively supported by nonaligned and neutral countries.

The tremendous constructive role which Soviet foreign policy and the long and persistent efforts of the Soviet Union and its active peace initiatives and the peace program formulated at the 24th CPSU Congress played in the appearance and development of the detente process is well-known and universally acknowledged (something which even our enemies do not deny).

Something else should be emphasized as well. Strictly speaking, to the Soviet Union the policy of detente was nothing radically new, for the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems--the starting premise of the detente process--is one of the foundations of its foreign policy. Ever since its appearance, the land of the Soviets has systematically and steadily pursued in the world arena a course aimed at putting an end to war and promoting peace among nations, applying in international relations the principle of peaceful coexistence and developing comprehensive, equal and mutually profitable cooperation among countries. Therefore, to the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist commonwealth the policy of detente was the natural extension, the creative development of their principle-minded and consistent course.

In the case of the ruling circles of most Western and bourgeois countries the situation was different. In order to convert to detente they needed not only a certain "correction" of their foreign policy course but, in many cases, a major turn from confrontation rigidity in relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to organizing relations with them based on accommodation and common sense.

In terms of content, the policy of détente is none other than a policy of normal, businesslike relations among countries with different social systems and their peaceful coexistence. It was natural, therefore, for the period which marked the birth and development of détente--the end of the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s--to become a time during which the principles of peaceful coexistence gained not only a particularly widespread recognition in the world but were modified in a series of important contractual legal acts concluded between socialist and capitalist states.

As confirmed by political practice, détente means above all eliminating the alarming tension in international affairs, which threatens mankind with nuclear missile catastrophe, reducing the threat of war and strengthening the foundations of peace. It is a political course leading not toward preparations for war but toward restraining the arms race and readiness to resolve existing or arising differences not "from the positions of strength" but through peaceful means, through talks, taking reciprocal legitimate interests into consideration. It means the conscientious observance of norms of international law, respect for the sovereignty of all countries and noninterference in reciprocal domestic affairs, as well as developing and strengthening trust and cooperation between countries and nations.

Western propaganda frequently presents détente as one kind of "one-way street" which benefits the Soviet Union and the socialist world alone, as a "concession" or as a virtual sacrifice on the part of the Western countries. In reality, détente proved to be a process benefitting international relations and all nations and countries without exception. This was manifested with particular clarity on the European continent, where détente was born and yielded impressive results. "All European countries were able to realize through personal experience the advantages of détente," the Warsaw Pact Peace Declaration notes. "They have no interests which do not benefit from the preservation and multiplication of the achievements of détente."

The main accomplishment of international détente, which undoubtedly proved its vitality and effectiveness in the 1970s, is unquestionably the fact that within a relatively short time the threat of war was reduced substantially, the foundations of peace were strengthened and it became possible to prove in practical terms that the atmosphere of the cold war is not a mandatory hindrance to relations between socialist and capitalist countries, that it could be eliminated and that a normal political climate, consistent with the development interests of all countries and peoples, could be created in international relations.

Various types of cooperation among countries with opposite social systems, which increased substantially under détente, also yielded substantial mutual advantages. Thus, for example, whereas compared with 1950 trade between COMECON and the developed capitalist countries had doubled by 1960, it had multiplied by 1970 and increased by a factor of 14.5 by 1975. This is a convincing and irrefutable proof of the realizable interest of socialist and capitalist countries in expanding trade and economic relations and a demonstration of the great potential which exists for the development of intercontinental cooperation, unless hindered by artificially created barriers.

The experience gained as a result of the fruitful influence of detente cannot be ignored. It is heavily influencing views on possible means of further development of international relations. In particular, it proves that the difficulties and problems which arose on the path of detente were not triggered by some internal and inherent shortcomings and faults within it but were the direct consequences of the fierce attack which was mounted against the detente process by its old enemy--the most reactionary imperialist circles, those in the United States above all--frightened and angered by the further development of the world liberation process and the progressively narrowing area of imperialist domination in the world.

The reactionary imperialist circles are trying to blame detente for the further weakening of the international positions of the so-called "free world," i.e., the world of oppression, exploitation and profit. Yet one can easily see that successes and victories in the world liberation process in recent times were not in the least brought about by detente although, understandably, its atmosphere contributed to the creation of favorable external circumstances for the struggle waged by the peoples for freedom, independence and social progress, hindering imperialist interference from the outside and the export of counterrevolution. National liberation and social revolutions had occurred even before detente became reality. They continued to win during the period of detente and they will be inevitable in the future as well, for this is a law of social development. Today's enemies of detente, who are trying to stop the global liberation process with a policy of force and diktat, will realize this on the basis of their own experience.

It is universally known that the aggressive militaristic course of the ruling U.S. circles and all extreme reactionary forces of imperialism, whose class hatred of socialism is stronger than their realism, has caused major harm to international relations in recent years. However, what is most essential is that imperialist reaction, despite all its efforts, has been unable to reject and bury detente. Detente is following its difficult path as a political course in international relations, retaining its viability as a sensible trend in their development.

It is important to note, above all, that the material fabric of detente was essentially able to withstand a major test of strength. Most of the treaties and agreements concluded in the 1970s between socialist and capitalist countries remain in effect and the arteries linking their political, trade-economic, scientific and technical and cultural areas continue to pulsate although with substantial hitches. It is indicative that the Western European countries are displaying a stubborn unwillingness to yield to the pressure of the American administration which would like them to denounce advantageous trade and economic agreements with the USSR and the other socialist countries. The main target of Washington's attacks--the gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe--was completed ahead of schedule.

The fruitful completion of the Madrid meeting of countries which participated in the European Conference on Security and Cooperation, despite the endless subversive efforts of U.S. ruling circles and some of their NATO allies, provided yet another proof that the Helsinki line and the policy of detente remain a promising trend in international relations, on the European continent

above all. The success achieved in Madrid--it is important to make particular mention of this fact--was ensured not only as a result of the active and persistent diplomatic efforts of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries but also largely as a result of the efforts of neutral and nonaligned states. In a number of cases a certain realistic approach was displayed also by some NATO members. The Stockholm Conference on Measures to Strengthen Trust, Security and Disarmament in Europe, which was convened in accordance with the Madrid Accord, was yet another manifestation of the trend of detente in international relations, despite all the difficulties and differences existing among its participants.

What is the "secret" of the viability of detente, repeatedly proclaimed overseas as buried? Above all, and once again, the fact that to this day it meets the urgent requirements of contemporary international relations and, furthermore, the basic vital interests of all countries and nations. The objective factors which played a decisive role in originating the process of detente remain and new important circumstances have been added to them.

The current outbreak of activities on the part of extreme reactionary imperialist circles and their eager aspiration to terminate the course of global social progress and suppress the aspiration of nations toward national and social liberation and acquire a dominant influence in the entire international arena by resorting to militarism and imperial diktat does not mean in the least that capitalism has secured or is in a condition to secure for itself any sort of global superiority. The overall ratio of class and political forces in the world continues steadily to change in favor of social progress, democracy and socialism.

The threat of a global nuclear missile war, the consequences of which could become catastrophic to human civilization, and which has drastically worsened in recent years, is a powerful motivation for the preservation, restoration to its former scale and further expansion and intensification of detente. For during that time the arsenals of mass destruction weapons increased even further and were enriched with qualitatively new weapons of death. According to United Nations data, based on the conclusions of specialists and scientists, the destructive power of nuclear weapons currently existing in the world is 5,000 times superior to the explosive power of the entire amount of ammunition used during the entire history of wars, including the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by American atom bombs. Existing stockpiles can destroy all life of the planet several times over.

Increasingly broader circles of political and social leaders in different countries, and large forums of scientists, physicians, men of culture, clergymen and peace-loving people, including even a group of retired generals and admirals from NATO countries, people who are particularly competent in military matters, are realizing this harsh reality and the exceptional seriousness of the current situation. "...The destructive power of nuclear stockpiles is nearing its critical level..." the appeal of the all-union conference of scientists for rescuing mankind from the threat of nuclear war and for disarmament and peace, held last year, stipulated. "The existence of human civilization and, perhaps, of life itself on earth, is threatened." It is indicative that an essentially similar conclusion, using their specific

terminology, was formulated in the pastoral letter of American bishops, which created a stir: "We are the first generation since Genesis with the power literally to destroy God's creation."

The only sensible and realistic solution to this situation, as common sense indicates, is to put an end to the arms race, the nuclear one above all, and to "block" such weapons and undertake reciprocally coordinated practical steps to reduce the already extant mass destruction weapons and, subsequently, to proceed toward disarmament in general. This opinion is being adopted by an increasingly wider circle of political and social leaders in different countries. Hence the growing support of the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union.

Concepts and doctrines which have originated in the United States in recent years, based on the "acceptability" of a nuclear war and the possibility of winning it and defeating the Soviet Union, to be followed by "the creation of a postwar world order compatible with Western ideals," are totally adventuristic and deprived of any kind of objective grounds.

The development of the situation and the steps taken by the USSR to strengthen its defense potential have resulted in the fact that the countries belonging to the two opposing social systems--the socialist and the capitalist--existing in the contemporary world have approximate parity in terms of military-strategic forces or, in other words, the identical ability to inflict catastrophic harm to each other. Under these circumstances, the declaration adopted at the summit economic conference of CEMA member countries emphasizes, "no world problem, including the historical quarrel between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved militarily." Such a path would be fatal to mankind. As to the aggressor himself, he would be inevitably doomed to a retaliatory destruction and can only hope to die second, a few minutes later.

Quite recently, some 12 years ago, the U.S. political leadership had reached the perhaps not very pleasant but realistic conclusion that approximate parity had been achieved in the military strategic forces of the USSR and the United States and that this circumstance had to be taken into consideration in the exercise of foreign policy. This conclusion was codified in official Soviet-American documents and was an essential element of the detente process and of improved relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

In its aspiration to undermine detente in its global confrontation with the Soviet Union, the current Reagan administration, which reflects the outlook of extreme reactionary and aggressive imperialist circles, is once again relying on a fictitious "American superiority" and has undertaken to disturb the military-strategic balance and, rushing ahead, to secure for the United States a dominant position in the world with a view to dictating its conditions to the USSR, the other socialist countries and all countries pursuing an independent policy. As we know, such hopes have repeatedly failed in the past. They are even more groundless today, when the Soviet Union has become a powerful state from the political, economic, scientific and technical and defense viewpoints.

The military-strategic balance between socialism and capitalism objectively contributes to maintaining peace and peaceful coexistence. The Soviet people invested a great deal of forces and funds to reach this parity and, as the leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state have frequently stated, under no circumstances shall we allow its disturbance. Unless the ruling circles in the United States and the other NATO countries abandon their mad plans, as Marshal of the Soviet Union D. F. Ustinov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of defense, asserted, "We must take measures and answer the increased nuclear threat. We must answer it in such a way that a feeling of self-preservation will dominate the intentions of a potential aggressor of mounting an aggression against us."

Therefore, we can confidently claim that the new spiral in the arms race, now promoted by the United States and its NATO allies, specifically by deploying new American nuclear missiles in a number of Western European countries, has not disturbed the military-strategic parity. The parity will be retained but on a qualitatively new and higher level and the American leadership will inevitably be forced, after "painful considerations," to use a favorite expression of Western commentators, once again to acknowledge that its innermost objective of attaining military superiority over the USSR and to dictate its will to the entire world will remain unattainable. Willy-nilly, the leaders of the Western countries will have to proceed from the concept of the equality in military-strategic forces existing between the two most powerful countries of today and the military parity between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and to build relations with them on the basis of peaceful coexistence and to promote a weakening of international tension, i.e., essentially, detente, regardless of the term which may be used in the future. It is self-evident that this prospect may come about only if a global nuclear missile war is prevented.

Therefore, objective reality and common sense mandate us to aspire not toward illusions of military superiority and suicide with a first strike but the preservation and gradual lowering of the level of military-strategic parity, lowering the tense confrontation and pursuing a weighed and realistic policy. As the Warsaw Pact Prague Declaration emphasizes, "all countries, if they care for the fate of their people and all mankind, must become objectively interested in preventing a sliding toward war."

In an effort to question the need for detente and to dull public concern for the fate of peace, Western propaganda tried to instill the idea that, allegedly, there are no special reasons to be concerned by the increased tension and arms race, for mankind has already survived one cold war and will survive another. In other words, international relations are asked to take the risky path of "balancing on the brink of war," in which a single careless or wrong move may lead to catastrophe.

Mankind, however, which is a community of people with intelligence, cannot agree with this prospect which is firmly opposed by anyone with common sense, who realizes the scale of the threatening danger. It would be pertinent to recall in this connection the view of a noted and experienced bourgeois political leader such as General de Gaulle. "The condition of a world based on a dangerous balance in armaments," he thought, "risks being disturbed and

converted into unrestricted warfare unless a development toward universal detente takes place."

The inevitable truth is that our nuclear century requires steps to resolve international clashes and conflicts other than military or related to a global military-political confrontation and a different nature of relations among countries with different social systems. It requires restrained, a correct attitude and political standards in relations or, in other words, peaceful coexistence, the specific embodiment of which at the present stage is detente. Under present-day circumstances a policy which ignores the existence of military strategic parity and the fact that a nuclear war cannot be an instrument for achieving any kind of political objectives and that no sensible alternative to detente exists irrevocably conflicts with the basic interests of the peoples and the objective requirements of social development and presents a mortal threat to all countries and all people on earth.

Yet another objective factor, the influence of which is increasing with every passing year, is a powerful motivation for a return to detente. This refers to the fact that the material facilities and natural resources at the disposal of mankind are not unlimited in the least. It is becoming increasingly clear that humanity cannot go on spending insane amounts of money on an unrestrained arms race without seriously damaging its own future.

In characterizing military expenditures by the bourgeois states, Marx wrote in his time that "in strictly economic terms, this is the equivalent of a nation dumping some of its capital into the water" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, p 67). The accuracy of this assessment is confirmed today a thousand times over. Suffice it to note that the total annual military expenditures of the capitalist countries had increased from \$24 billion in 1950 to \$400 billion in 1982. They are opening an increasingly widening gap in the state budgets, heavily damaging the economy, curtailing the financing of social programs and leading to increased taxes, prices and inflation. All of this is taking place at a time when mankind is facing increasingly greater and irreversible tremendous global problems of a social, national, ecological, energy, raw material, demographic, food and other nature, the solution of which will most directly determine the foundations of human life on earth in the foreseeable future.

The global nature of this task is determined not only by the fact that it affects the vital interests of the population on earth but the fact that its implementation requires the joint efforts of the absolute majority if not of all countries and huge funds which could be raised again as a result of their collective contributions. A considerable reduction in military expenditures would provide a real source of the necessary substantial material investments in resolving global problems, without any harm to the activities of the individual countries. Estimates have shown that "freezing" nuclear weapons alone would release \$4.5 billion annually for such purposes.

Understandably, the efforts which the various countries would make could be possible only under the conditions of peace, peaceful coexistence, reciprocal understanding and extensive international cooperation. This will demand of

their governments a high degree of political responsibility, realism and governmental wisdom.

Naturally, the existence of objective factors which encourage the restoration of detente in international relations does not in itself guarantee its revival and development. These also require the influence of a specific subjective factor--a corresponding political course, a deliberate desire and taking of practical steps by the various Western states and governments.

However, everything seems to indicate that the stubborn enemies of detente, who control foreign policy in some of the largest capitalist countries, have no intention of changing their guidelines, at least for the immediate future. A persistent and fierce confrontation is taking place between two political trends and two forces--supporters and opponents--on the subject of the fate of detente. The task of tremendous historical significance currently facing the broadest political and social circles in the world, which form a potential powerful antiwar coalition, is to make the governments of the Western countries, the United States above all, acknowledge the objective realities existing in the world and to impose upon them a policy of detente in international relations.

An important feature of today's circumstances is the increased danger of thermonuclear war, which threatens the future of civilization and increasingly energizes the self-preservation forces of mankind, which can prevent a catastrophe and block it reliably.

The firm stand held by the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries, opposing the imperialist strategy of intensifying tension, global confrontation and balancing on the brink of catastrophe, is a decisive obstacle blocking the arbitrariness of the forces of aggression and war through their strategy--the defense of peace, the prevention of a nuclear conflict, peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems and their mutually profitable cooperation. The extensive program for specific action presented in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speeches and all constructive and extensive initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries irrefutably prove their firm aspiration to achieve a radical change for the better in this dangerous development of events in the world. "In turn, I wish to emphasize most firmly," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said in his recent answer to the appeal of leading personalities of the Socialist International, "that the Soviet Union will continue steadfastly to pursue a course of restraining the arms race, a return to detente and strengthening European and international security."

Members of the Nonaligned Movement, many of whom experienced through personal example the fatal consequences of the policy of arms race pursued by imperialism and the fanning of new hotbeds of tension, are joining increasingly actively in the efforts to defend peace and peaceful coexistence and detente in international relations. As I. Gandhi, prime minister of the Republic of India, emphasized at the 7th Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries in New Delhi, "today an end to all existence is the only alternative to peaceful coexistence." It is no accident that the documents of the conference included the stipulation that the most

important problem in the age of nuclear weapons is "disarmament, survival, and coexistence," and to appeal to take efficient steps to stop a sliding of international relations toward a global nuclear conflict.

The influence of a broad-based pacifist and antinuclear movement is growing. In the course of the struggle against the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe it has reached unprecedented scale and has become one of the important factors in the international situation as a whole. Certain difficulties which acted as the source of its development and the aspects of more tangible results of the mass actions have not discouraged but only spurred the active participants and become an incentive in the search for new slogans and means and methods of struggle with a view to upgrading its impact on parliaments and policies of governments in Western countries. Thanks to its growing numbers and variety of participating political forces, social strata and age groups, the antinuclear movement is becoming today the true embodiment of the commonest collective mind of the peoples throughout the world.

The increasing pressure in the political circles of capitalist countries, along with reactionary and aggressive wings, of more realistically and sensibly thinking people, major representatives of whom were Roosevelt and Churchill in their time, instilled a great deal of confidence in the fact that real possibilities exist of turning international relations back to normal channels and detente. Nixon himself was forced to take into consideration the harsh realities of the nuclear century. Today as well as in years all leading political parties in Western Europe and influential political parties approve of the intentions of the U.S. administration.

For example, the fact that socialist and social democratic parties--which are an influential political force--favor a continuation of detente will unquestionably influence the further development of foreign policy in the capitalist world, in Western European countries above all. This was confirmed and again by the results of the 19th Congress of the Socialist International, which was held in Berlin and organized with 70 million members and was attended by 1,000 delegates, and which was held in the spring of 1983. The congress's resolution, which stated the need for a continuing search for new and improved international relations, pointed out that "the political line for Europe is to achieve detente between East and West must be maintained." In particular, the Social Democratic Party of Germany, the British Labor Party, the Italian Labor Party, the Party of the Democratic Socialist Movement (PDSI) and the Danish Social Democratic Party favor the restoration of detente.

In the United States there is a reflection of the increased pressure and influence of socialist and social democratic views in the 1980 electoral platform of the Democratic Party on problems of national security, entitled "Preventing Nuclear War: A Strategy of the Struggle for Peace," formulated by the candidates of this party for the forthcoming presidential elections who today are less and less numerous and represent political forces with the USSR.

Such a platform and more comprehensive views do not appear, naturally, in a "realistic" approach alone. They have the "moral" consequences of the situation created in the present world order by the power struggle of classes.

Americans, Britons, West Germans and Italians or, in other words, the anti-and-file voters, worried by the threat of a thermonuclear war and increasing tension in the world. Dozens and hundreds of thousands of people are flocking with increasing firmness for an immediate improvement in the international atmosphere at demonstrations, collection of signatures and petitioning, and, despite intensive stupefaction efforts of bourgeois mass information and propaganda media which are, as a rule, under the control of imperialist monopoly circles. This applies above all to the significant part of the population in Western European countries who remember the period of unbridled war and the good times and who would like to bring it back. The British people are "brimming with resolve not to allow the death of detente," as quoted by the American political expert R. Livingston in THE NEW YORK TIMES (1984-07-07).

Noteworthy in this connection is the recent statement by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the noted opponent of detente: "...Both as a concept and a desire to engage in constructive dialogue with the Russians, detente is no longer so important for the reason alone that if the public in the Western countries does not believe that the governments are making efforts in this direction, they themselves would lose popular support which is necessary in preserving the combat capability of their countries." This precisely is the "secret" of the intense propaganda gyrations performed by the current U.S. administration and officials in the camp of their allies. As though on order they have poured floods of verbal assertions of their desire to preserve peace and their readiness for a "dialogue" and the resumption of political relations at any hour."

After committing a crime by drastically worsening the international situation with the deployment of new American missiles in Europe, the NATO countries have turned to verbal hypnosis as a tranquilizer. Some highly placed personalities in the Western European capitals have even begun to assert their readiness for "true detente," "real detente," "detente free of illusions," etc.

What lies behind such views? Could it be that those in power in the United States and other NATO countries have actually drawn the wrong conclusions? Unfortunately, so far such a view remains absolutely groundless. As a rule, statements concerning "true," "real" and "detente free of illusions" conceal the West's old considerations of "linking" some kind of "peace" steps to the mandatory preservation of the sociopolitical status quo in the nonsocialist part of the world, i.e., the perpetuation of colonialism, racism, reaction and despotic regimes. The West expects to pay for the "agreement" to return to a policy of "peace" at least by abandoning the principle of proletarian internationalism and solidarity with the national and social liberation struggle in the Third World.

Since no one can seriously conceive of this happening, we are dealing with an obvious political simulation, a propaganda cover for the American course. This is confirmed by numerous facts. Thus, while talking about the subject of its peacefulness, Washington is continuing to lead an arms race with the USSR. It has approved an ever increasing military budget for 1985, totaling almost \$300 billion, while President Reagan has called himself to "joke" by making provocative statements about the Soviet Union and asserting that NATO will "continue to strengthen its defense."

and nuclear potential." However, it is a well-known fact that observing the principle of equality and not threatening the security of either party is a mandatory prerequisite for strengthening international security. The United States and the NATO countries are proclaiming their interest in mutually profitable economic cooperation. Immediately after that, however, the U.S. Senate amended the law on controlling exports by introducing new restrictions on trade with the USSR and the other members of the socialist community. It is clear, however, that normal intergovernmental relations, be they political or economic, cannot develop in the presence of such "sanctions" and discriminations.

International detente cannot be based merely on verbal declarations concerning peaceful intentions. It needs an incomparably more reliable and firm foundation consisting of practical matters and a realistic policy aimed at reducing tension in the world, terminating the aggravating confrontation and controlling the arms race.

Therefore, the peaceful phraseology coming out of Washington and the other NATO capitals--at any rate at present--appears hypocritical and pharisaic. The very fact that it is becoming necessary to resort to it more frequently and increasingly, however, is quite eloquent. It proves, above all, that the aggressive imperialist circles must dissemble, dodge and use demagogic camouflage in order to conceal their true plans and intentions.

A broad spectrum of powerful political forces operates today in favor of turning international relations back to detente: the socialist and the other peace-loving countries, a number of political parties and public organizations and multimillion-strong masses of working people. Despite all differences and frequently conflicting socioclass views, political concepts and national characteristics, they agree in the main--the understanding that a catastrophic danger is threatening all countries and nations, all mankind, and that extreme and efficient steps must be taken to remove the existing danger. The influence of these forces is already seriously restricting the willfulness of extreme reactionary imperialist circles and exerting increasing influence on the main trends in the development of international relations.

The basic interests of mankind imperatively urge an end to the risky confrontation in the world and giving detente a "second breath." This is also called for by the sense and the desire of the nations. Basically, international relations have become ripe for the firm establishment of the norms of peaceful coexistence and detente in their practice. These healthy beginnings have long been making their way in cutting through the ice ever since the times of the notorious cold war and the rattling of nuclear missiles today. This precisely is confirmed by the noteworthy fact that since World War II periods of detente have repeatedly appeared at different times in international relations. Noteworthy, for example, are periods remembered as "the spirit of Geneva" and the "spirit of Camp David" of the second half of the 1950s. Although these periods lasted no more than a few months, the fruitful development of detente covered an entire decade. This reveals an unquestionable trend which is becoming stronger and which, as logic indicates, has a confident future.

Naturally, no sensibly thinking politician would belittle the seriousness of the threat hanging over the planet and the risk of thermonuclear war. However, the real opportunity of avoiding a catastrophe is also greater. Mankind has no right to miss or fail to use it, for today the question of whether detente has a future is essentially consistent with another question: Is there a future for mankind? In other words, no acceptable and sensible alternative to detente exists. By realistically and soberly assessing the danger of the situation which has developed in the world, the communists also reject the thesis of the fatal inevitability of war. Such fatalism is dangerous, as Gus Hall, U.S. Communist Party secretary general justifiably pointed out, for it proceeds from the impossibility of preventing a war, thus consequently increasing the danger of war. The communists are aware of the really existing powerful forces which can prevent a sliding toward nuclear catastrophe. They have faith in the victory over adventuristic and aggressive imperialism, for they have faith in the mind and will of mankind and the natural desire of the nations for self-preservation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003
1802/1

LEADING THE CREATIVITY OF THE MASSES. ON THE PUBLICATION OF BOOK BY V. V. GRISHIN, 'PROBLEMS OF PARTY-ORGANIZATIONAL AND IDEOLOGICAL WORK'

AU12106 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 13, Sep 84 (signed to press 3 Sep 84)
pp 121-128

[Text] The Soviet people are fulfilling unprecedentedly complex, large-scale and historically new tasks of perfecting developed socialism under the leadership of their experienced political leader--the Leninist Communist Party. "This work cannot be fulfilled," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the April (1984) CPSU Central Committee plenum, "without extensively developing the initiative and creativity of the masses and without involving them most actively in resolving the main problems of social life. We also strived for this when we adopted measures necessary for accelerating the growth of our economy and when we directed party forces to decisively improve ideological activities. We will also henceforth pursue this policy."

The Moscow party organization--a combat detachment of the CPSU and reliable support of its Central Committee--steadily and firmly pursues the party policy of mobilizing the energy and will of the working masses and reaching more and more new frontiers in building a new society. This is convincingly recounted in the recently published book by V. V. Grishin, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Moscow City Committee First Secretary ((V. V. Grishin, "Problems of Party-Organizational and Ideological Work. Selected Speeches and Articles," Moscow, Politizdat, 1984). In point of fact, all the socioeconomic, political and cultural-ideological problems that our people are resolving are concentrated in the intense, purposeful activities of the capital's communists because Moscow is not only the country's largest city and industrial, cultural and scientific center--it is also the capital of the great Soviet Union and the focus of all systems of political and state-administrative management. The fact that "for every Soviet individual Moscow is the heart of the motherland, the city loved since childhood, whose name has become a true symbol of our socialist fatherland" (p 61) determines the special responsibility of Moscow communists for the state of affairs in all sectors of work. The diverse experience of the Moscow party organization in mobilizing the efforts of millions of Muscovites to fulfill the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and of subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums is extensively and fully elucidated in the book and is interesting and instructive. It is an important part of the CPSU's accumulated experience in the task of leading the processes of perfecting developed socialism.

I

Considerable attention is devoted in the collection to elucidation of questions relating to the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, analysis of the contemporary international situation and problems of ideological struggle. This is understandable: In our time, there is perhaps not a single person unaware of the direct dependence of his fate and the future of his children upon the resolution of most major world problems. And Soviet people, who have borne on their shoulders two enemy invasions and a multitude of different attempts to hinder our building during the brief history of our worker-peasant state, are accustomed to following changes in the world situation through their own experience. V. V. Grishin's oral and press statements, which are included in the book, contain an operative, precise and convincing answer to questions of this type which trouble Muscovites, just as they do all Soviet people.

As was noted at the 26th Party Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, the international situation has become essentially more complicated in recent years. Having unleashed an unprecedented arms race and undermined the process of detente in international relations, the most aggressive circles of imperialism, and primarily U.S. imperialism, are attempting to cross over to an offensive against the forces of peace and social progress. They strive to break the existing correlation of forces in the world arena, cast off socialism, bring the national liberation movement to its knees and reverse the wheel of history. They make political and military provocations, international terrorism, ideological diversions and dirty "psychological war" against the USSR, the other socialist countries and any independent states unwilling to subordinate themselves to imperialist diktat, a weapon of their state policy. All this, the substance of the firm and principled policies of the Soviet state, which not only upholds the interests of its own people but also the interests of preserving universal peace and strengthening the security and cooperation of all peoples on earth and the USSR's constructive proposals aimed at improving and normalizing the international situation, is related in V. V. Grishin's speeches and articles.

Correct understanding of the contemporary world situation and of the essence of the political and ideological antagonism between socialism and imperialism is a most important source of increasing the political awareness of the Soviet people and of strengthening and setting their patriotic feelings in motion, as well as a powerful factor compelling every honest Soviet citizen to exhibit revolutionary vigilance, further increase the organization and cohesion of our people around the CPSU and strengthen the economic and defense might of our socialist motherland by means of conscientious and highly productive labor. The Moscow party organization does a great deal to explain the noble, humanist meaning of the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and tirelessly cultivates the class awareness of the working people. "We strive," the author writes, "to make every Muscovite realize that in the present conditions when the international situation has been aggravated through the fault of American imperialism, conscientious and highly productive labor acquires particular significance. Now one must work well not only for pay and not only to improve one's living conditions. To an even greater extent, work

is becoming the prime responsibility of the Soviet individual and his patriotic duty to the motherland, the people and the present and future generations. The might of the land of the soviets and a reliable defense of peace are primarily ensured by highly productive, creative and excellent work performed by every individual in his sector and in his work place" (p 304).

Socialism's strong ideological opposition to capitalism--the world of violence and oppression, the world of exploitation of the working people and spiritual corruption--sets many urgent tasks for the party organizations and all who participate in the ideological-political and moral education of the people. The imperialist bourgeoisie begrudges no money and eschews no means in its attempts to erode the spiritual unity of the Soviet people, undermine the class foundation of the socialist social awareness and revive unhealthy morals and sentiments alien to the nature of our system by means of massed ideological diversions.

Communists in the capital conduct purposeful and systematic work to expose the subversive actions of our class enemy and resolutely to counteract any influence exerted by bourgeois ideology. The 25th Conference of the Moscow City Party Organization demanded that every party organization be able to promptly and convincingly rebuff certain people's blind imitation of stereotypes of the bourgeois way of life, fault-finding, money-grubbing, indifference to state and social concerns and philistine-like interest in Western sources of information, which spread malicious anti-Soviet slander. Systematically and scientifically organized counterpropaganda must be, V. V. Grishin said in his report at the conference, "an inalienable part of all ideological-political activities. We must strive for operative and effective counterpropaganda work, conduct this work while taking the condition in the capital and the features of the ideological enemy's influence upon the Moscow population into account, organize the study of the ideological situation and public opinion in the labor collectives and wage a determined struggle against hostile rumors" (p 345).

The ideological-political education and class tempering of the younger generation have great significance. Young people have no extensive and firm experience in the world let alone social experience and it is precisely for this reason that our ideological enemies particularly gamble on distorting their awareness. Of course, experience is accumulated over the years, but the acute nature of the ideological struggle makes it impossible to wait until all young men and women are mature from a sociopolitical and world outlook point of view. The book reveals how senior comrades devote a great deal of attention to the education of young people based on the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the communist party and the Soviet people and how a great deal of effort is expended so that all of our young people are worthy of their fathers and grandfathers, skillfully continue the cause of building a new society, preserve and increase the great spiritual and social-moral property of socialism and are always ready to rise to the defense of their great motherland and repel any aggressor.

Struggling against the historically doomed, but still strong, world of capitalism with its noxious ideology remains a most relevant task of our time. Strengthening the class awareness of the Soviet people, their political

maturity, deep belief in the rightness of our cause and understanding of the great historic meaning of the Soviet people's intensive work and heroic struggle for socialism and communism, are reliable guidelines of communist education which, as the book shows through the best experience of the work of Moscow's party organizations, must organically merge with the fulfillment of socioeconomic tasks and with the varied organizational work of the CPSU and Soviet state.

II

"Politics cannot help but take first place over economy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 42, p 278). This permanent Leninist behest forms the basis of the communist party's approach, which has justified itself over the decades, to determining those most important recurrent tasks of economic construction, the fulfillment of which most soundly and reliably leads us to the achievements of long-term program aims. It is precisely this essentially political approach to leading the capital's economic and social development that also distinguishes the activities of the Moscow party organization. Communists in the capital proceed from the party directive that both a further improvement in the working people's material and cultural standard of living and an increase in our country's economic and defense might require a decisive improvement in the efficiency of the national economy and the transfer of its branches to a chiefly intensive path of development at the contemporary stage. And this depends on fundamentally improving the planning, management and organization of production and also on speeding up scientific-technical progress and introducing its achievements into practice. In Moscow's conditions, it is particularly clear that a rise in labor productivity, especially now when the problem of labor resources has become exacerbated, has truly key and paramount significance for the economy's progress and the resolution of social problems. Perfecting the economy in the conditions of developed socialism means following a path of constant growth in labor productivity and improvement in the quality of products and in the economic indexes of production.

As is evident from the material in the collection, communists in the capital persistently pursue a policy to speed up scientific-technical progress, reconstruct production on the basis of advanced technical equipment and technology, perfect its organization and, in the final analysis, increase its efficiency. Moscow possesses great scientific potential--more than 1,000 science and scientific service organizations and 76 higher education institutes are concentrated there. Scientists participate in the fulfillment of 147 all-union scientific-technical programs, which are combined with special-purpose, comprehensive programs implemented in the capital; these latter programs ensure the realization of current and long-term plans for Moscow's economic and social development. The city party organization sets the task of making better and fuller use of this vast scientific potential and increasing its contribution to the development of a multibranch national economy.

Experience shows that close ties between science and production bring good results. There are 45 active scientific-production associations in Moscow and the time between the designing of a product and its introduction into regular

production is shortened twofold in these associations. Other organizational forms such as cooperation agreements between enterprises and scientific institutions as well as higher education institutions also produce good results.

"It is necessary to strive," the book emphasizes, "to achieve the maximum effectiveness of scientific studies and their quick introduction into production. Science must be linked more closely with practice and the enormous possibilities of scientific institutions must be more widely utilized in solving the tasks facing the industrial, transport, construction and other city organizations. At the same time, the scientific institutions' attention must be guided toward systematically developing the basic research work. The entire power and all possibilities of party influence must be turned to accelerating scientific-technical progress" (p 49). All these efforts must result in a fundamental technical retooling of production on the basis of an extensive automation of technological processes, the development of flexible automated production lines and the introduction of automated machine tools and machines, robot technical equipment and computer technology. It is precisely in this way that the policy of production reconstruction will ensure the growth of labor productivity, a reduction of manual labor and the substitution of obsolete types of products with new, progressive and better products.

What is perfectly obvious and urgently needed in this connection is the fact that economic management must be raised to a higher level, that the economic thinking of economic cadres must be changed, and that the production management and coordination between different sections of management must be perfected. The struggle of the capital's party organization for the implementation of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress is also aimed at fulfilling these goals. "The main slogan of the day is that of achieving the maximum level of organization and efficiency," V. V. Grishin emphasizes. "And this implies a strict fulfillment of the planned tasks and contractual obligations, an efficient work rhythm in every detachment of the unified national economic complex and an adjusted system of economic communications. This implies the strictest discipline and responsibility and the ability to manage the tasks prudently and economically and to be oriented always and in every respect toward achieving high final results" (p 107). There are great reserves available in this connection for improving the state of affairs: The book cites examples showing what a great practical effect a rise in the standard of economic leadership, an improvement in the coordination among different sections of the city's economy, the elimination of departmental barriers and a heightened responsibility and competency of economic leaders can and must have. The Moscow party organizations wage a persistent struggle for the utilization of these, so to say, management reserves. At the December 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, V. V. Grishin noted that establishing order in planning and management and in the material-technical supply represents one of the important conditions for the capital's enterprises stable operations, for the most efficient utilization of reserves and for establishing order in production.

At the same time, the CPSU economic policy is termed policy, after all, because the broadest masses of the working people, and not only the scientific and economic cadres, actively participate in the fulfillment of its tasks and

goals. The experience of recent years has shown that a clear and politically emphasized statement of the ripe tasks of economic and social development and of strengthening order and organization evokes a wide response among the masses, mobilizes their energy and, under the skillful leadership provided by party organizations, ensures noticeable positive changes in production and in social life within a short time. Lenin's everlasting behest is fully justified: "The reason for our victories is: Our party's and the Soviet authority's direct appeal to the masses of the working people, pointing out to them every successive difficulty and every successive task; the ability to explain to the masses why it is necessary, at one or another time, to lean with all forces now in the direction of one side and now in the direction of another side of the Soviet situation; and the ability to raise the energy, heroism and enthusiasm of the masses by directing the intensified revolutionary efforts to the most important current tasks" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch", vol 39, p 305).

The Moscow CPSU gorkom and raykom precisely proceed from this precept in directing the efforts of party organizations and economic leaders toward ensuring that educational work among the people and the struggle for improving discipline and order will be inseparably linked to plan fulfillments, a further growth in labor productivity, the improvement of work quality and the improvement of work conditions for workers and employees. "The main field of communist activity is in labor collectives, in the thick of masses," this is how the party organization of the capital city poses the question (p 205).

It is precisely this type of work organization that also explains why Moscow's working people constantly increase their activeness in the struggle to fulfill the tasks set by the party and why the work initiatives advanced by them, initiatives in conformity with the requirements of the time and with the specific conditions of a given branch of social labor, are so varied in nature. "Moscow communists," the author notes with justified pride, "have a considerable number of valuable, progressive initiatives to their credit, these initiatives having become widespread. Some examples are the drawing up of personal plans to increase labor productivity and economize material and energy resources, the brigade contract, the Moscow railway workers' initiative to drive heavy trains and many more" (p 206). Muscovites have been the initiators of competition in honor of important ideological-political events in the life of the country such as the 60th anniversary of the USSR, the 25th anniversary of the movement for a communist attitude to work and now--the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War. The overhaul of railway carriages and containers, which has been organized at the city's enterprises, is yielding a great economic effect and leading to an improvement in economic links. The movement "Honor and Glory Through Labor!" which the CPSU Central Committee has highly appraised, has spread on an all-union scale. This movement is aimed at fulfilling the most topical tasks for developing the socialist economy--improving labor productivity, reducing prime production costs, intensifying the economy regime, making better use of basic production funds and equipment, increasing consumer goods' production and strengthening discipline and order.

Supporting those who make valuable initiatives and production innovators, spreading progressive experience, perfecting the organization of socialist

competition and overcoming elements of formalism in this--all this is conducive to a further increase in the activeness of the labor collectives and to the broad manifestation of the working people's talents. It is worth noting that the book is full of information: It relates production successes, the labor heroism shown by the collectives of many of the capital's enterprises and building sites, their individual sectors and brigades and the glorious representatives of Moscow's workers class.

The Moscow party organization directly concentrates its efforts and its multifaceted organizational and ideological-political work in the labor collectives and lower production units--the brigades (they unite more than half of the city's workers)--in brief, where the success of the cause is decided. It is precisely here that party influence must be intensified, which is aided by the formation of party groups and the introduction of party organizers in the brigades (and also into small collectives). "The party organizations and economic leaders," the book says, "should constantly engage in the selection and training of the foreman and brigade leader cadres and should advance communists who are highly professionally trained and who enjoy authority among their work comrades to these positions. Special attention must be paid to expanding the party stratum in the brigades, forming party groups within them and enhancing the vanguard role of communists" (p 233). It is precisely in the brigades, in the sector and workshop collectives and in the enterprise that the fate of national economy plans is decided. The success of this work is guaranteed, the book notes, when all the working people become direct participants in it, when it is based upon the awareness and initiatives of the masses and when the conditions are created for their highly productive labor and when order, discipline and organization are strengthened in all sectors of social production.

III

The multifaceted experience of the Moscow party organization in ensuring close unity between ideological-educational work and organizational activities and the fulfillment of economic tasks, as well as in increasing the efficiency of communist education, deserves attention. Increasing the masses' activeness, awareness and organization is an indispensable condition for successfully perfecting developed socialism. "Implementation of the five-year plan, the rates of our progress and, naturally, the strengthening of the country's defense capability in many ways depend on how we mobilize the people's spiritual energy and increase their working social activeness," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Of course, this condition is properly fulfilled when work connected with ideological education is brought as close as possible to the vital tasks of the day and to the people's interests and needs, and when it is conducted in a concrete and purposeful fashion. The book notes that "one of the prime functions of ideological work conducted by the party organizations is to convey party ideas and decisions to communists and all working people in conformity with the concrete conditions of every enterprise and collective. It is important that the party word, which is brought to the masses by our propagandists, political information officers, agitators and lecturers, increases the creative activeness of the working people and increase

Muscovites' contribution to the fulfillment of national economy tasks" (p 133). The movement "The Propagandist for the Five-Year Plan," the sending of agitators into the brigades and the party gorkom's and raykoms' increased attention to participation by the leading cadres of all social labor branches in educational work particularly contribute to this decisive turn toward practically oriented ideological-educational work.

Regularly held united political days, during the course of which leaders at various levels inform the working people on the state of affairs, explain everyday tasks and answer questions troubling the people, have a great social effect. The scale of mass political work in Moscow is also attested to by statistics cited in the book: approximately 2,000 people's universities and more than 5,000 special interest clubs function in the city and more than 70,000 lecturers, 94,000 political information officers and 235,000 agitators work there.

The book contains a considerable amount of critical appraisals of existing shortcomings and omissions in the ideological activities of a number of party organizations. It is frequently the case, V. V. Grishin notes, that one encounters a situation where ideological-educational work is conducted as if it functioned outside the productive and social life of the collective. Lectures and studies in the system of political and economic education and talks by agitators and political information officers do not touch upon the most important problems of people's life and work. The Moscow party organization expends constant effort to completely eradicate these shortcomings, raise ideological activities, particularly political training, to the level of the high requirements of the society of developed socialism and make these activities truly alive and effective. "While forming the people's communist awareness, Marxist-Leninist education," it was emphasized in the accountability report given by the Moscow City Party Committee at the 25th conference of the capital's communists, "is called upon to actively influence the perfecting of production and economic activities and the improving of our entire work" (p 340).

The system of Marxist-Leninist training and political and economic education has undergone fundamental reorganization in recent years and has become both closer to the requirements of social life and deeper and richer in content. Activities aimed at forming a scientific, communist world outlook in Soviet people "must strive to ensure," the author notes, "that communists and all working people thoroughly assimilate the revolutionary teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, since they are the key to understanding and resolving the social development problems. The style of the political education work and mass political training network must be changed, active forms of study developed and they must be given greater practical direction. It must be ensured that every individual thoroughly understands party policy, is able to practicably apply his knowledge and clearly perceives and fulfills his social duty in practice" (p 219).

Naturally, this reorganization has also affected the matter of training and retraining ideological cadres; the experience of the Moscow party organization is rich and interesting in this respect, as is the experience of drawing the aktiv of the soviets of people's deputies and the social organizations into

ideological-educational work in the masses. In actual fact, in this case we have before us an example of directly combining organizational and ideological-educational work. That is why this aspect of the matter was given such close attention by the CPSU gorkom at the conference of the party group of Moscow soviet deputies held this August. Speaking before communist deputies, V. V. Grishin said "The sources of a deputy's activeness lie in firm contacts with the labor collectives and with the voters and in awareness of their needs and requirements. A deputy must be an agitator, propagandist, guide and active participant in all measures outlined by the party and organs of Soviet power. He is called upon to assist the formation in the working people of a correct understanding of the problems of communist construction and ways of resolving them. A deputy must set an example of a conscientious attitude to work and state interests, as well as an example of one who observes laws and he must also be honest, upright and modest. Communist deputies of the Moscow soviet should set an example by participating in the work of sessions, permanent commissions and territorial and production deputy groups" (MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 22 August 1984). This principle--backing up educational work with organizational activities and the personal example of progressive people, ideological workers and leading cadres--is implemented by communists in the capital in a consistent and persistent way, as is the course to comprehensively develop citizens' social creativity and further perfect socialist democracy.

A great deal of attention is devoted in the collection to moral education. A businesslike approach and organic unity between word and deed are also necessary here. What is more, the Moscow gorkom proceeds directly from the fact that "in the organization of precise and well-coordinated work and in the ensuring of discipline lies the basis of a city's normal life and the education of its population" (p 32). Moral education can at a minimum be reduced to verbal exhortations--it is effective where the practical tasks of social life, of improving people's everyday life and work and perfecting collectivist mutual relations are fulfilled.

Moscow has accumulated considerable experience in moral education in connection with the struggle, organized and directed by the city party organization, for model order in production, in the labor collectives, in the microrayons and in residential areas and for consolidation of the moral principles, developed and adopted by the working people of the capital, of the inhabitants of the hero-city. "Educating Muscovites in the spirit of moral principles," the book notes, "helps create a healthy moral-political atmosphere in the labor collectives and in residential areas, and also makes it possible to activate the struggle against deviations from the norms of communist morals such as embezzlement of national property, drunkenness, hooliganism, parasitism, bribetaking, black-marketeering, lack of discipline, laxity and egoism" (p 68). In those areas where this struggle is waged in an organized and purposeful way and through common efforts, there is every foundation to speak of a high degree of maturity of collectivism and collectivist social relations.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this struggle. Only in the course of this struggle and as a result of it can the social-moral principles of developed socialism completely and fully triumph, the vestiges of bourgeois

and petty-bourgeois views and morals be removed from life once and for all and a strong immunity to alien ideological influences from abroad and to antisocial sentiments be developed in every citizen. An important aspect of this matter is to intensify the ideological-political education of young people who have not passed through the school of life and do not have any personal political experience. The conclusion that "the class tempering of the working people and the uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology acquires special significance" in contemporary conditions, has a direct bearing upon the education of young people and upon Komsomol work under the leadership of the party organizations. "It is exceptionally important to be able to convey the truth about socialist society, its advantages and its peaceful policies to the broad popular masses and every individual separately in an intelligible and convincing form. We have no grounds for assuming a defensive position on any principled matter" (p 216).

A firmer foundation for strengthening the connection between the education of young people and life, the revolutionary-transforming practice of the Soviet people, and the prospects of our social development is being formed during the implementation of the general educational and vocational school reform. Its importance goes far beyond the bounds of the education system. "It is an important component part," as V. V. Grishin noted at a conference of the Moscow aktiv of education workers, "of the systematic and comprehensive perfection of developed socialist society."

"The party has developed a scientifically substantiated concept of training and educating young people and of preparing them for life and work in contemporary conditions" (MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 28 Aug 1984). Both the shape of the future Soviet generations and our society's future depend on how the tasks of the reform are fulfilled through the common efforts of the education system, the enterprises and the party, soviet and economic organs.

Literature and art figures and workers at Moscow's cultural institutions make a significant contribution to the spiritual life of the capital and the entire country. The city party organization devotes unremitting attention to problems of developing socialist culture, educating the creative intelligentsia and increasing their contribution to the spiritual life of developed socialist society. This is a responsible sector of communist construction, the book's author believes, and an important factor that exerts an increasingly profound influence on people. By absorbing all the best and most progressive that has been created or is created by mankind, literature and art make people's lives brighter, richer and more interesting. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of an intelligent book, a talented performance, a good cinematic film and a sincere song. Work, a good book and a popular song go hand-in-hand in life (p 172). The task of the capital's party organizations work with the creative intelligentsia, as the book shows, consists of increasing the educational influence of artistic culture, clearly and truthfully highlighting the best aspects of our life, establishing the political and aesthetic ideal of communism and contributing to the ideological-moral perfection and comprehensive development of Soviet people, as well as to their greater cohesion in work and in the struggle for the ideas and cause of the Leninist party.

Fusing the efforts of all means of educating and spiritually enriching Soviet people into one, raising social awareness to a new level in accordance with the requirements of developed socialism and joining the strength of Marxist-Leninist ideas, and the socialist-cultivated feelings and aspirations of the Soviet individual with the power of collectivist social relations--such is the meaning of the great and varied ideological activities of the Moscow party organization, which plays a prominent role in the life of the Leninist CPSU.

IV

Internal party work problems, its style and methods and the growing influence of the party organizations on all spheres of social life occupy a prominent place in the book. Practice has convincingly shown the justice of the CPSU's conclusion that its leading and guiding role in the life of Soviet society naturally increases in contemporary conditions as the scale and complexity of the tasks of social development similarly increase. However, this natural law by no means operates of its own accord or spontaneously. On the contrary, this requirement of life, as V. V. Grishin wrote in PRAVDA, "obliges every party organization to show constant concern for the social and spiritual development, and for the growth of the awareness and activeness and vanguard role of every communist" (p 201). This also defines the principled importance of that diverse sum of problems covered by the general concept of "organizational-party work."

The book reveals in detail the significance the party attaches to establishing the Leninist style of work everywhere, the content of which is constantly being enriched with accumulated experience. A scientific approach to social progresses, constant reliance upon the masses, party adherence to principle and high efficiency, concreteness and exactingness, development of criticism and self-criticism and an irreconcilable attitude to any manifestations of formalism, bureaucratism and show have always been and remain requirements of the Leninist style, the author writes.

The capital's party organization does not weaken its efforts to further perfect the work style of every party committee and bureau and every primary organization.

And these efforts bear fruit. The book notes the fact that the level of organizational work performed by the CPSU raykoms and the primary party organizations is rising. Great significance is attached to improving the planning of this work, analyzing the state of affairs in the labor collectives, giving practical help in the provinces and reducing the number of conferences and meetings. Control and work performance checks are being increased and communists are better informed about fulfillment of their proposals and critical observations. Commissions for control over administrative activities and apparatus work have become more active. All these changes in internal party work can be briefly summed up as follows: The party committees and primary organizations have begun to operate more purposefully and concretely and take better account of the demands of life.

This can be called the regular policy of communists in the capital and the city party committee. "The party gorkom and raykoms," the book says, "channel

their efforts into concentrating the strictest attention on the main problems, backing up adopted resolutions with organizational activities, raising the level of organizational and economic leadership, everywhere creating a climate of intolerance of shortcomings, more extensively generalizing and spreading positive experience and considering the opinion and proposals of the working people" (p 249). As the materials published in the book illustrate (speeches and reports given at Moscow City Party Committee plenums and at meetings of the party aktiv, and also the accountability report given by the gorkom at the 25th conference of the Moscow party organization)--both positive experience of organizational work and existing shortcomings, are analyzed in detail and exactly everywhere on the basis of concrete facts of the work of the rayon committees and individual primary organizations and in close connection with the fulfillment of ordinary socioeconomic and cultural-ideological tasks.

The book devotes a great deal of attention to the problems of a communist's responsibility for the success of the common cause and ways of increasing the activeness of every party member, raising his ideological-theoretical level and enhancing his vanguard role in work and in social life. "Communists' active position in life is most clearly apparent in their fulfillment of party tasks. This is a good school for cultivating high ideological-political, moral and businesslike qualities and organizational skills. At the present time 90 percent of the members of the city party organization have permanent tasks (June 1963--ed.)" (p 204). This school is effective when it is backed up by party control and work performance checks in accordance with Leninist traditions.

The high exactingness shown by the Moscow party organization with regard to the political, businesslike and moral qualities of communists, including new party recruitments, is particularly evident regarding the selection, placement and education of cadres. It is superfluous to recall how important this matter is and how much its significance increases in the conditions of the capital, where the powerful administrative apparatus is concentrated. It is natural that this question should be constantly kept in sight by the book's author. He notes that the increased tasks of developing socialism require the further perfection of work with cadres--forming a reliable reserve, constantly studying people's businesslike and political qualities, verifying these qualities in practical matters, persistently implementing the party principle of publicity in cadre policy and promoting individuals to responsible posts while taking the opinion of the party organizations and labor collectives into account.

"When promoting workers to leading posts," V. V. Grishin emphasizes, "their abilities as organizers and educators must be taken most fully into account, as must their irreproachable moral aspect, efficiency and initiative and moral qualities such as honesty, modesty and a sensitive attitude to people" (p 242). Guided by these criteria, the capital's party organization resolutely rids itself of workers who compromise the lofty title of party member, abuse their official position, or even transgress the law. One of the central tasks problems with the Moscow party organization is that of creating them in a spirit of increasing their responsibility for the better of work, as well as their organization and strengthening party, trade and labor organizations.

As a whole, the capital's communists strive to always be on top of the demands of the time and to be worthy of those glorious traditions that were founded in Moscow by the bolsheviks of Lenin's time. For all units in the city party organization, "perfecting organizational-party work means strictly observing the Leninist norms of party life and the principle of democratic centralism, improving the selection, placement and education of the cadres, organization of control and work of performance checks and selection of the best representatives of the working people, primarily of the workers class, for the ranks of the CPSU, increasing party discipline, intensifying the ideological tempering of party members and strengthening their ties with the masses" (p 12). It is precisely this arrangement of matters that makes it possible for the Moscow party organization to successfully and worthily lead the tireless, selfless work of the capital's working people to fulfill the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and to perfect developed socialism.

Lenin said in one of his speeches on the threshold of the fifth anniversary of the Great October Revolution: "We are convinced that if our revolution has achieved true success then it is because we have always devoted our main attention to local authority and to the experience of the localities themselves" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 45, p 249). The vast experience of the creative work of such an important party organization as the Moscow one, is an important contribution to the general treasurehouse of the invaluable experience of the Leninist CPSU. Undoubtedly the book reviewed will be read by the party and ideological aktiv to their great advantage.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/1

- END -

INDEX TO KOMMUNIST, NO. 13, 1984

[The following index, compiled by JPRS, is provided as a service to its consumers.]

A

Agriculture

- agricultural development in Siberia, 77
- scientific research, 77
- Siberian Academy of Agricultural Sciences, 78

B

Baykal-Amur Railroad, 2

C

Chernenko, K.U.

- party leadership of Komsomol, 9
- interview, PRAVDA, 2 Sep 84 (text), 5
- militarization of space, 6
- Near East, 6
- Soviet-Japanese relations, 1
- U.S. elections, 5
- U.S.-Soviet relations, 5, 7

Communist and Workers' Parties, CC Secretaries' Conference, 25

Counterpropaganda, 142

CPSU

- culture, 149
- work in Moscow, 140

D

Detente, 126

- Western attitudes toward, 130

Disarmament

- Madrid Security Conference, 130
- nonaligned movement, 135
- Stockholm Security Conference, 131

E

Economics

economic experiment, 65

Ethiopia

Commission for Organizing Working People's Party, 106

illiteracy, 111

prerevolutionary economy, 103

socialist revolution, 102

Union of Marxist-Leninist Organizations, 105

Workers Party of, 108

G

Gorkiy, Maksim, 88

Grishin, V.V.

review of new book by, 140

I

Ideology

attacks on Marxism-Leninism, 26, 52

education of youth, 142

Marxism-Leninism and alienation, 42

Marxism-Leninism and theory of individual, 39

materialism, 55

J

Japan, 1

Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 1

Soviet-Japanese relations, 1, 2

K

Komsomol, 9

defense, 17

Soviet economy, 14

cadres, 22

housing, 16

membership, 21

L

Lenin, V. I., 10, 88, 116

M

Marx, Karl, 28, 41

Military parity, 132

N

Nuclear weapons, 1, 3, 126, 131

in space, 7

R

Religion

- antiwar movement, 115
- communist attitude toward, 120
- divisions within, 114
- liberation struggle, 115

Russian Association of Proletarian Writers, 89

S

Socialist realism, 97

Space

- militarization of, 6, 7

W

World Festival of Young People and Students, 18

Writers' Union

- First All-Union Congress, 88
- multinational aspects of, 96

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

28 Dec 1984